

AMERICA

A·CATHOLIC·REVIEW·OF·THE·WEEK

VOL. XXV. No. 16 }
WHOLE No. 619 }

August 6, 1921

{ \$4.00 A YEAR
{ PRICE 10 CENTS

CONTENTS

	PAGE
CHRONICLE	363-366
TOPICS OF INTEREST	
The State and Industrial Enterprise—Reflec- tions on Soldiers—The Stage and the Catholic Church—Archbishop Kordac of Prague.....	367-374
COMMUNICATIONS	374-375
EDITORIALS	
The New Archbishop of Baltimore—Super- governments—Christianity's Alleged "Fail- ure"—That Prussian, von Steuben!—Dr. Tigert's Conclusions	376-378
LITERATURE	
The White-Robed Lyrst of Notre Dame— Benedicite!—Reviews—Books and Authors— Books Received	378-383
EDUCATION	
The Poor Schoolteacher	383-384
SOCIOLOGY	
Mint, Anise and Cummin	384-385
NOTE AND COMMENT	385-386

Chronicle

Home News.—The approval expressed by Japan, in a formal communication to the State Department at Washington, of the suggestion that the nations of the world should meet to discuss plans for a general disarmament, has cleared the way for the proposed conference and it is likely that the formal invitations will be issued in the near future. France, Great Britain and Italy had already signified their readiness to accept such an invitation, but Japan showed some hesitation about doing so because the discussion of disarmament in Secretary Hughes' plan included the discussion of Pacific and Far Eastern problems. Japan declared that it was ready to attend the conference, but before committing itself desired to be advised as to the scope and nature of the subjects to be discussed in connection with Pacific and Far Eastern matters. Secretary Hughes urged that the Japanese Government should not press its inquiry as to the nature and scope of these latter subjects, in view of the fact that it was desirable that the full acceptance of the invitation of the American Government should leave the matter open for future adjustment. In the meantime, before the meeting of the conference, the precise agenda of the conference might be arranged by diplomatic exchanges.

Disarmament Conference

In a gracious reply, which the State Department received on July 27, Japan accepted Secretary Hughes' point of view, with the single reservation that the introduction into the conference of problems such as are of sole concern to particular Powers or such matters as may be regarded as accomplished facts should be scrupulously avoided. From present indications it appears likely that the conference will be held at Washington on or about Armistice Day, November 11, 1921.

In a note delivered by Dr. Narciso Garay, Minister of Foreign Affairs for Panama, to Secretary Hughes, Panama has asked that her boundary dispute with Costa Rica be referred for settlement to the Permanent Court at The Hague. Panama insists that Chief Justice White, by whose decision of the boundary question both countries agreed to consider themselves bound, exceeded his instructions and decided more than he was empowered to decide, and that, therefore, his decision is invalid. Dr. Garay declares that Panama will be obliged to refuse to abide by the White decision, should the United States continue to insist on that course of action, but he expresses the hope that a peaceful settlement of the controversy may be found by arbitration. Since Costa Rica has been eliminated from the dispute, the question is one between the United States and Panama:

Panama's Appeal

In view of these facts, which are known to the world, Panama respectfully requests the United States Government, in the terms of Article 38 of the Hague Convention for the pacific settlement of international disputes, of which both countries are signatories, to submit to the arbitration of The Hague's Permanent Court the very point at issue, formerly between Panama and Costa Rica, now between Panama and the United States, to wit: Is the White award within the terms of the Arbitral Compromise so as to make it valid against Panama? The conflict between the two countries being of a legal nature and obviously justiciable, and the vital interests and national honor of the United States being not in cause, the Panama Mission hopes that due deference for the sovereign rights of the Republic of Panama and for the cause of arbitration, so dear to the United States, will prompt the acceptance of a solution that will prevent a settlement by force.

President Harding, in an official message sent to both houses of Congress on July 26, asked for legislation by which financial aid shall be extended to the railroads.

Railroad Relief

The plan he suggested calls for no appropriations, it merely asks that the War Finance Corporation be empowered to take over from the Railroad Administra-

tion the securities deposited by the railroads for equipment, and to sell them or purchase them at prices not below the amount originally allowed by the Railroad Administration. In this way funds to the amount of \$500,000,000 will probably be raised, with which it will be possible to meet the claims of the railroads. In accordance with the President's expressed desire, Representative Winslow on July 28, introduced a bill amending Section 207 of the Transportation act in such a way as to provide for the plan suggested. The bill has the approval of the Administration.

Belgium.—On July 28 the cornerstone of the new library of the University of Louvain, planned as a gift of the American people to the people of Belgium, was

**The New Louvain
Library**

laid with elaborate ceremony in the presence of King Albert, Cardinal Mercier and many distinguished guests. Among these were former President Poincaré of France, and the Belgian Premier, Mr. Carton de Wiart. The reading of a message from President Harding was one of the features of the exercises. Addresses were made by King Albert, Cardinal Mercier and Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University, New York, who as chairman of the American committee for the restoration of the library, also laid the corner stone of the new building. Among other things Dr. Butler said:

America will watch this splendid building rise like the phoenix from its ashes to bear witness to the unbreakable bonds that bind America to Belgium, to France, to Great Britain and all their allies. A nation cannot do battle in a great cause or for a noble ideal without receiving a new baptism of spirit. Such a new baptism of spirit has come to the people of the United States, and this act of theirs, so small when compared with their ambitions and their hopes, is convincing proof that America will never stand idly by, while liberty is turned into slavery or while the cannon and flames of war carry destruction to the most splendid monuments, to human aspirations and human accomplishments.

The raising of a \$500,000 fund to rebuild the Louvain library has been in progress for nearly two years under the direction of an American National Committee headed by Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University. So far only \$151,000 have been collected. Unless the United States speedily provides the balance, Cardinal Mercier has stated that the new Louvain authorities will be compelled to turn to the Continent for aid.

The University of Louvain is the largest in Belgium. It has twenty-five buildings, some old, others more modern, scattered about the city. Of these, three, including the library, were burned during the German invasion. The priceless treasures of the library were then practically wiped out. Only some of the library walls, pillars and buttresses remained. Mr. Whitney Warren, the American architect, devised the plans of the new building.

The history of the University of Louvain stretches

back over five centuries to the day when a Duke of Brabant secured from Pope Martin V a Bull sanctioning its erection in 1425. The famous Clothmakers' Hall, *Les Halles*, thanks to the generosity of the citizens of the town, sheltered the students. The Hall became the depository for the priceless library which was destroyed in 1914. It was not until the beginning of the seventeenth century that a demand was made for a special library building. In 1627, Laurent Beyerlinck, a former student of Louvain and Canon of the Cathedral of Antwerp, laid the foundation for such a collection and bequeathed his library of 852 books, mostly historical and theological, to the University. These books were housed in the old Clothmakers' Hall, and the library was opened to use in 1636. By the beginning of the eighteenth century, the collection had grown so large that a wing was added to the original building. Between 1771 and 1797, 12,000 volumes were acquired.

It is stated that on August 25, 1914, when the library was destroyed it contained over 200,000 volumes. While surpassed in number of volumes by other libraries in Europe and the United States, some of the collections were in their way unique and it will be well-nigh impossible to duplicate them. This is especially true of the books and manuscripts dealing with the entire history of the religious struggles in the Netherlands, of a magnificent collection of more than 350 *incunabula*, with a rare series of successive early editions of the Bible. There was also a splendid collection of *Jesuitica* relating not only to the work of the Jesuits in the Low Countries, but also to their work in different countries of Europe, especially in Upper and Lower Germany. The library was very rich in the publications of the early reformers and political pamphlets growing out of the heated discussions and rivalries of the Thirty Years' War. The loss of these treasures is irreparable.

Among its gems the library also contained invaluable manuscripts of the twelfth century, containing typical examples of post-Carolingian writing, lives of the Saints, psalters and books of "hours." To these it had added rare liturgical manuals of the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, missals and antiphonaries containing splendid illuminations and full-page miniatures. One of its most precious treasures was the autograph manuscript of Thomas à Kempis. The older archives of the University itself formed one of the most important sections of the manuscript division. The library was also extremely rich in modern books on science, including the latest works on chemistry, electricity, bacteriology and medicine. It will be recalled that from 1882 to 1906, Cardinal Mercier taught philosophy at the University. During the whole period of his labors there, he endeavored to restore scholasticism to the place of honor it had formerly held, and bring it into harmony with modern science. Both by precept and example he greatly forwarded the spirit of scientific research.

Ireland.—Last week's news from Ireland was meager and uncertain, each succeeding day bringing denials of the preceding day's dispatches. In the maze of reports and

*A Triangular
Squabble*

counter-reports sent out by interested persons and bureaus, the only item that is certain, is the squabble between the King, the Premier and Northcliffe. On Monday, July 25, American and two British papers published interviews on the Irish problem given in New York by Northcliffe and H. Wickham Steed, the editor of the *London Times*. According to these interviews the King went to Belfast to bring about a settlement of the Irish problem. The report declared:

It is not generally known that under the constitutional form of government the King has still a good deal of power when he chooses to use it. In this case he has done so with good effect. At the last meeting he had with Lloyd George before leaving for Ireland the King asked him, "Are you going to shoot all the people in Ireland?" "No, your Majesty," the Premier replied.

"Well, then," said the King, "you must come to some agreement with them. This thing cannot go on. I cannot have my people killed in this manner."

King George went to Ireland intending to make his own speech, just as his uncle, the Duke of Connaught, did last year in India. The King spoke as the head of the British Empire and not as King of England or of Ireland. He got under the skin of the Irish people by his generosity, and that is what gave them confidence in the peace overtures, which they would not have felt in the Lloyd George Cabinet without his backing.

It was the King too who saw Smuts and got him interested in the Irish question. I know that the latter had a great deal to do with winning over the Sinn Feiners to the idea of a conference and making peace with England without separation from the Empire. He told them what he knew about the ideal Republican government and that they were just as well off with the constitutional form of government in Great Britain under their own local management.

When Lloyd George and the Cabinet realized the feeling of the King and the people on the question of peace with Ireland, the invitation to De Valera to come to London followed in forty-eight hours.

When King George sailed for Ireland the Cabinet tried to spike his efforts by making speeches in the Lords and Commons three hours afterwards, which were intended to irritate the Irish people. This annoyed the English people very much and when the King returned he had the biggest reception outside of Buckingham Palace he had ever received since the war began in August, 1914.

These perfectly fanciful words and others like them drew forth the following repudiation uttered by Lloyd George in Parliament, July 29.

Statements have appeared in certain organs of the Irish and English press attributing words to the King relating to Irish policy. They appeared in the form of an interview which Lord Northcliffe seems to have given in the United States of America and to have forwarded to his newspapers here for publication.

It is impossible to follow all these calumnies, but those to which I refer are of so categorical a character and are so calculated, if believed, to prejudice seriously the chances of an Irish settlement, that his Majesty has authorized me to read to the House of Commons the following on his behalf:

His Majesty, the King, has had his attention directed to certain statements reporting an interview with Lord Northcliffe appearing in the *Daily Mail* and reproduced in the *Daily Express* and some of the Irish newspapers. The state-

ments contained in the report are complete fabrications. No such conversations as those which are alleged took place, nor were any such remarks as those which are alleged made by his Majesty.

His Majesty also desires it to be made quite clear, as the contrary is suggested in the interview, that in his speech to the Parliament of Northern Ireland he followed the invariable constitutional practice relating to speeches from the throne in Parliament.

I hope that this statement may do something to sterilize the effects of the criminal malignity which for personal ends is endeavoring to stir up mischief between the Allies and misunderstandings between the British Empire and the United States and to frustrate the hope of peace in Ireland.

The following day Northcliffe cabled as follows to the King's secretary, Lord Stamfordham:

Please convey to his Majesty with my humble duty my denial of ever having ascribed to his Majesty the word or words as stated by the Prime Minister yesterday. I gave no such interview.

On July 30, Stamfordham answered:

I have communicated to the King your message received by me this morning. His Majesty is glad that it confirms the statement made on his authority by the Prime Minister in the House of Commons yesterday.

With this the incident was officially closed. The British papers, however, clamored for an explanation, asking how Northcliffe's name was substituted for Steed's who gave the offensive part of the interview, and demanding to know what was really said.

Northcliffe smiled and the British Embassy canceled a dinner party that was to have been held in his honor. But the outstanding fact remains that the British Government had been slaughtering the Irish.

Russia.—According to a dispatch from the Rosta News Agency of Moscow dated July 30, Secretary Hoover's offer to send relief to Russia's famine sufferers

*Soviet Accepts
Hoover's Terms* was accepted by the Soviet authorities, the reply being made in the name of Leo Kamenoff, head of the Famine Relief Committee. It runs:

The Russian Government upon learning of the proposals made by Herbert Hoover in the name of the American Relief Administration, finds them quite acceptable, including the question of the release of American citizens. The Russian Government considers it necessary to fix as soon as possible the exact conditions on which the immediate relations are to begin.

Its humane intentions guarantee the feeding, medical aid and clothing of the million children and invalids. For this purpose the Russian Government considers it useful that Director Brown or any other person authorized for the negotiations should immediately come to Moscow, Riga or Reval. The Russian Soviet Government expects a quick reply, stating the place and time for the negotiations.

The first of the American prisoners to be set free was Mrs. Margaret E. Harrison of Baltimore, a newspaper correspondent, who was first arrested in June, 1920, and again in the following October.

On July 26 the Russian trade delegation in London issued a statement regarding the famine in Russia based

on official dispatches received from Moscow. According to the latest estimate the sufferers number 10,000,000.

The Famine

The worst district is in Southeastern Russia and includes the area which stretches from Astrakhan in the south to Simbirk in the north and goes east to Ufa. This area is entirely agricultural, except for two or three factories. Up to this year the area was described as the granary of Russia. That is why all Russia is affected.

Roughly speaking, the famine area represents one-twentieth part of Russia; but in the past it provided not less than one-half of the Russian harvest. During the revolution it supplied the whole of the food of the country.

Siberia, with a population of 50,000,000, is expected to give a harvest of from 300,000,000 to 325,000,000 poods (60 poods make a ton), whereas in the famine area, with a population of 30,000,000, the harvest is expected to yield only 30,000,000 poods.

Today in the famine area the people are living on inadequate rations saved from previous harvests. On an average they receive only about half a pound of bread per day. In the Ukraine it would be double that amount and in Siberia probably a trifle more. But it can be seen what must happen unless relief is obtained for the famine districts. In two or three months' time the situation will be most serious. We want transit facilities as well as grain. The question of grain is complicated by lack of transport. Our biggest problem is the absence of railway engines and fuel, which makes it very difficult to convey grain from Siberia to the famine areas.

We can claim that Lenin and Trotzky and all those mentioned as attending the famine conference are united in one common object, to provide transport and grain. It is quite clear that if help is provided there must be some very strict organization in order to insure a fair distribution of the assistance. This organization can be attained only if people of good-will dispense relief and internal plots planned from abroad be avoided. These can only aggravate the position.

The *Izvestiya*, the Soviet official newspaper in Moscow, states:

Russia has absolutely no harvest this year. Peasants are reduced to despair. They are mowing unripe corn and fleeing panic-stricken before death and starvation. Many are dying of cholera and typhus. Besides the intense dissatisfaction of the peasants, there is greater unrest among the workmen, who have been starving even when the harvest has been good and villages had corn. This causes a decline in production. Even the Communist party, we perceive, is failing in courage as a result of the immense tasks. Many imagine that we cannot cope with the misfortune which has fallen on our country and is resulting in frequent desertions of the faint-hearted. Now hard work and stern orders are needed to bring the people to their senses and re-establish order from a state of chaos.

The New York *Tribune's* Berlin correspondent cabled on July 30 that throngs of starving peasants were advancing on Moscow, and stated that Minister of War Trotzky,

The Peasants' Revolt

armed with complete dictatorial authority, had left Moscow for the Volga region, to direct the operations of the Eleventh Infantry and the two cavalry divisions which were assigned to keep the advancing peasants beyond the famine barrier erected by the Government.

The Moscow *Pravda* reports that the famine is particularly severe in Samara, Saratov and Kazan, where

thousands are dying every day. In southern Russia the people are eating grass, bark, roots and straw. The *Tribune's* correspondent continues:

As far north as Kirsik one sees nothing but blackened, naked fields. The railway stations are besieged by pale men, women and children in ragged clothes who rush onto the train platforms almost before the train stops and with outstretched hands beg: "Help, for the sake of Christ! We are dying of hunger!"

Not only the peasants but the city dwellers as well are deserting their homes in a vain search for food. Many of those who are not killed by hunger fall victims to cholera, which has spread throughout southern Russia, laying the population low by thousands.

All trains in the south are now being guarded by detachments of troops as the hungry mobs frequently have been looting unprotected carriers. All railroad employees in the Ukraine have been provided with arms to keep off the hunger-maddened crowds at the stations. Armored cars have accompanied some trains.

Turkey.—The Turks made a heavy combined attack two weeks ago against the Greeks north and south of the recently captured stronghold of Eski-Shehr. Fourteen

Greeks Still Advance

divisions attacked the Greeks' left wing and seven the right, but the Turks were first repulsed by Constantine's troops and then put to rout by the Greek cavalry. The Turkish losses are estimated at 30,000. King Constantine made a triumphant entry into Ku Taia, which was taken by the Greeks early last month, and the advance of his army has steadily continued. A dispatch dated Smyrna, July 24, stated that the Turks tried to recapture Eski-Shehr, but without success. After forty-eight hours of hard fighting, the Greek flanks enveloped the Turks, compelling them to abandon strong positions with severe losses. The entire Turkish casualties were about 6,000 men and forty guns were captured. The Greek front, it is said,

is longer than was the French front during the World War. It also has long lines of communication which have to be guarded against raids by irregular bands. The advances had been for the sanitary service a continuous fight against the possibility of contagious disease. Besides, there were times when members of special services had to lay aside their work and take up guns. All these contingencies had been prepared for in advance by the General Staff.

An Athens dispatch of July 26 stated that the Turks' losses in killed, wounded prisoners and missing came to seventy-five per cent of their entire fighting strength in Asia Minor. The statement adds that the Greeks have driven such a wedge into the Turkish lines that the Kemalist forces at Angora, the capital, on the northern branch of the Bagdad railway, have been cut off from those at Konieh, 150 miles to the south. It was reported on July 29 that Mustapha Kemal Pasha's broken forces, now numbering but 50,000 men, had taken up positions on a range of hills about forty miles east of Eski-Shehr and were being carefully watched by several strong Greek divisions stationed ten miles away.

The State and Industrial Enterprise

JOHN A. RYAN, D.D.

THE importance of economic institutions for the common welfare is obviously great and fundamental. The material well-being of the people depends primarily upon the manner in which goods are produced and distributed. In our country these processes are carried on by private enterprise. The farms, factories, railroads, stores, shops, banks, and all the other instruments of production and distribution are owned and managed by individuals and private corporations. The more efficiently these industries and activities are operated, the better generally speaking, will the common welfare be promoted; for the greater will be the sum-total of goods produced and available for distribution among the people.

If the means of production and distribution were owned and managed by the State, the responsibility of larger and efficient production would rest upon the State. The fact that these instrumentalities are under private control does not, however, relieve the State of all responsibility. It is still charged with the duty of protecting, promoting, and regulating private industrial enterprise in such a way as to further to the utmost the common welfare. In the United States, the national Government maintains several departments whose object is the promotion of industry. Chief among these are the Department of Commerce and the Department of Agriculture, which have to do respectively with commercial enterprise and farming. The national Government has also undertaken the irrigation of land on a somewhat large scale. It operates a reserve bank system and a farm loan fund. It has spent several hundred million dollars in the building and maintenance of the Panama Canal. A part of its fiscal system consists of tariff duties for the protection of various industries. In many other ways our national Government concerns itself with the promotion of commerce and industry. In a lesser degree the various States have likewise directly or indirectly given assistance to industrial enterprise.

How far should the State go in this field? To answer this question fully would require much larger space than is allotted to this article. The general principles can, however, be stated at sufficient length to provide the outlines of an answer. Whenever State assistance to any industry promotes the general welfare it is justified. Such assistance might take the form of scientific and adequate information, as provided by the Department of Commerce and the Department of Agriculture. It might amount to a temporary subsidy for certain industries. We say a "temporary subsidy" because the common welfare will hardly ever justify permanent financial assistance. If an industry cannot maintain itself after the initial difficulties have been overcome, it is not worth preserving from the viewpoint of the common good. An

indirect subsidy in the form of a protective tariff may likewise be justified for the upbuilding of an industry that cannot maintain itself alone in the primary stages. This is the "infant-industry" theory which supposedly is at the basis of our protective tariff policy. Unfortunately, this theory is no longer exemplified in the case of more than a small fraction of the industries which now receive assistance from the tariff. For many years, the great majority of our protective tariff schedules have benefited particular industries and particular groups of persons at the expense of the community as a whole.

Nevertheless, this policy is not wholly nor universally to be condemned. For a second general principle justifies State assistance to particular industries and localities, even when this arrangement does not promote the welfare of the whole people. As we have seen in a preceding article, the Catholic doctrine of State intervention justifies legislation on behalf of a class, as well as that which affects favorably the general interest. Recall the fundamental statement on this subject by Pope Leo XIII. The determining factor here is the degree of need experienced by the class or locality in question. For example, if the welfare of the inhabitants of a particular city depends upon the continuation of a particular industry which is unable to maintain itself in competition with similar industries elsewhere, State assistance in the form of a protective tariff or even by a direct subsidy would be justified, at least, until such time as new industries are established in that community, or its inhabitants have been enabled to obtain residence and livelihood in other places. Similarly, financial assistance in the form of loans may and should be extended to industries and groups of people in temporary and unusual emergencies.

The State can promote industrial enterprise negatively, by refraining from the enactment of unduly restrictive legislation. In the United States this is at present a very important issue. On the one side are those who maintain that our State and Federal Governments do not sufficiently restrain the anti-social practices of business, especially big business; on the other side are the champions of large concerns who maintain that the regulative hand of government already lies too heavy upon industrial enterprise. Whatever may be the facts of the situation, the ethical principles are sufficiently clear. The first is that regulative measures should not be so drastic as to discourage the average man from saving money with a view to investment in productive enterprise, nor to prevent him from establishing and carrying on a legitimate business venture. We say the "average man" because it is not the duty of the State to provide those conditions of investment and profit which seem to be demanded by a few captains of industry whose standards have been vitiated by the bad habit of obtaining enor-

mous gains in return for relatively unimportant services. The community can get along very well without such men. State regulation which discourages their activities will redound to the general good. The second principle is that the various unfair devices by which monopolies are able to stifle competition should be prevented by the State. This is in the interest, not only of industrial opportunity for individuals, but of the general welfare. In the third place, industrial enterprise should be so regulated that no business concern can impose upon the consumer unjustly high prices. The price of an article is unjustly high whenever it enables business men and capitalists to obtain profits and interest rates which are more than sufficient to induce them to continue their industrial functions. In the light of this principle we can solve such questions as those concerning the excess-profits tax, and the regulation of the coal industry. So long as the former device leaves to the business man sufficient profits to make it worth his while to carry on his enterprise efficiently, it is not unduly burdensome. A similar statement holds good with regard to those who are engaged in the production of coal.

The emphasis placed on the average man in the foregoing paragraphs is of particular significance at this time. During and immediately following the war a considerable proportion of American business men obtained enormous and unusual profits. As a consequence, their conception of normal gains, of the gains which are necessary to encourage business initiative and activity, became perverted and exaggerated. Hence we find them opposing regulative measures which ten years ago would have seemed to them entirely reasonable. Obviously, these temporary and extraordinary notions cannot be taken as a standard for determining the necessary freedom and opportunity which the State must accord to industrial enterprise. The State must guide its action by the normal, average human motives. These it must permit to have reasonable scope in the field of industrial endeavor, as in every other department of human activity. Industrial regulation which gives this measure of freedom is not excessive nor contrary to the common good; industrial regulation which gives more than this degree of business opportunity is unnecessary and injurious to the general welfare.

The activity of the State in relation to industrial enterprise is bound to increase. The growing complexity and the necessary developments of our industrial system make this inevitable. A comprehensive forecast of the lines along which this extension of State activity will take place, cannot be attempted here. Two or three developments may be briefly mentioned. The common good requires a very large extension of State aid in the establishment of farm colonies on our immense area of swamp lands, arid lands, and cut-over timber lands. A vast extension of government credits is likewise necessary to check the deplorable decrease in farm tenancy, and to enable men who have the desire and the capacity

to become cultivators of the soil. Finally, legislation is necessary not for financial aid, but for the encouragement in other ways of cooperative societies, in agriculture, banking, manufacture, and merchandizing. All these are projects which directly affect immense groups of our population, and which, therefore, have an immediate relation to the welfare of the whole people.

Reflections on Soldiers

SAMUEL FOWLER TELFAIR

AFTER I had been discharged from the army I served for a time as life guard on an island off the Southern coast. I spent each day, from early morning until the sun had dropped into the back bay behind the palms and pines, either on the water's edge or in the sea itself.

One particular day, I remember, a strong nor'wester was blowing. Now nor'westers, as the next guard up the beach used to say, "nor'westers is hell on life guards," and this one was howling as it unfurled the white plumes of the waves and lashed them into a fury of foam as they raced onto the beach and fell.

After swimming around the ropes to gauge the current and safe distance for the few bathers, I caught the crest of a big roller and rode to shore. Chilled and exhausted, I wrapped my old trench coat about me and stood watching the miracle of the angry sea.

The racing, slate-green horses, with their white manes flashing in the wind, fled on and broke into a million sprays, leaving a rainbow-colored lather of froth to mark their line until the next wave broke. The air lashed by an invisible power seemed a reminder of man's impotence and loneliness.

I shivered and drew my coat closer about my sun-bronzed body, and just then became conscious of a young man seated on the sand behind me, with an open book. He had evidently been making up his mind to speak to me, for he said: "Don't you miss the army and the camp life?" I answered, "Sometimes I do. It's a hard life but it's a man's life." Then as he went on to question me about my organization, the length and place of service, I became curious in turn and asked, "What outfit were you with?"

"I, too, am a soldier," he said, "but in a different army, the greatest army. That's the reason I didn't join yours. I am a student-priest."

Years have passed and I do not know what sort of soldier the lad has become, but surely he was right, his is the greatest army, that of the living Saviour of Men.

We can see its magnificent past spread out across the centuries, we can see its great generals, its traitors, miraculously few, its thousands of martyrs; we can see the never-failing ranks of its foot-soldiers pressing on, bearing the flag of Christ into eternity. Fighting ignorance, enduring hardships, conquering doubt, jeers, ig-

nomines, they pass before the light of the present. Sometimes it seems that they are fighting to prove that a dream is a reality, an ideal an achievement and a mystery a living fact, yet their march is victory and their progress triumph, for they serve the Church of the living God.

All types of men make up this army. There are soldiers who enter like young knights, to make real a vision, and fail; soldiers who enlist in a wave of enthusiasm and lose their love of the fight; and soldiers who find the battle too arduous and the march too wearying; but for the vast majority the light of the vision which drew them never grows dim, the fragrance of the oil of consecration is always fresh upon their hands and in their declining years they go to the altar of God with all the joy of their youth.

What distinguishes these soldiers from all others is that all, even those who have proved unfit, all *willed to serve*, and they go marching on. The marvelous thing is their spirit, for what in all history can compare with this eternal army, this mighty host of men who turned aside from pleasure to follow the Prince of Sorrows?

St. Francis, the Knight of Poverty, looks down on the serried ranks, which he deemed himself unworthy to join; St. Ignatius urges them forward, he has fought the great fight; St. Joan counsels and comforts them, her voice lives; she hears them face to face; St. John, who leaned on Christ's bosom, opens wide the dreams of His love by way of promise; St. Paul unbars the gates of sympathy to ease their weary march, and St. Michael, radiant in light, leads his army in review before the face of God.

It may be that many soldiers do not see their Commander's gleaming sword, do not hear the melody of the song of Heaven nor taste the sweetness of Life it-

self. It may be that even the wonder of wonders, the mystery of Jesus come to them, does not charge their life with rapture. But they march on, fighting each day's fight, beset with routines and unremunerative toil, battling with sin and with miseries that must seem innumerable, for every priest is a real soldier, bringing the world to the Son of God and the Son of Man to the world.

His struggle has saved us. Without Him life would be unthinkable, and His priests have handed down and bring to us all that is loveliest in life. Each day they keep alive among us imperfect people perfection of Life, each day they strive to draw us from our shallowness and urge us, too, to fight, so that into our carnal hearts love may enter and in our minds beauty may live.

The men whom the world calls soldiers fight for king, country, commerce, that one people may rule another, and when they die men inscribe upon their tombstones the words "Greater love than this hath no man, that he lay down his life for his friend," but the men who make up the army of God do a harder thing than laying down their lives, they live them. Each man is a knight of a great Round Table who serves the Grail of the King of Kings. Even though his mind be small and his nature commonplace, each man, when he stands before the Holy of Holies, becomes a Galahad and every dreary duty is a deed that makes sure the victory of Christ, each life is a sacrifice that the beauty of His perfect love be ours—yours and mine—in the name of Our Lord King, Jesus, the Eternal Sacrifice, under whose banner the Knights of St. Michael fight, the banner of the blue sky set with silver stars, which floats in perpetual light, streaked with the crimson blood of its soldiery who have lived and died that the Kingdom of Heaven, our heritage, may be truly ours.

The Stage and the Catholic Church

GEORGE BARTON

PROBABLY no institution on earth offers such a gold-mine of material to the aspiring dramatist as the Catholic Church. The Church is founded upon the greatest drama in the history of mankind, and the struggles and persecutions it has undergone for more than 1,900 years no less than its triumphs and accomplishments make it a tempting and fascinating subject for those who would hold up the mirror to nature. Some of the most remarkable plays ever staged have dealt with episodes in the life of this marvelous organization, and the only wonder is that such a unique and rich storehouse of human interest has not been drawn upon more liberally.

There are two possible reasons for this hesitancy on the part of playwrights. One is that the subjects to which it lends itself must be treated in a big way and with a degree of talent bordering on positive genius. The other is the fear that the secular handling of a sacred theme

may jar upon the sensibilities of a portion of the theater-going public. Yet everything depends upon the treatment of such plays, and honesty and decency presupposed, there is no legitimate reason why the dramatist should not make use of valuable historical material. Shakespeare, with unerring craftsmanship, seized many striking figures and employed much matter connected with the life and history of the Catholic Church in the building of his series of plays. Cardinals, Bishops, legates, priests and friars walk through the various scenes, but nearly always they talk and act in character. They are also used to point a moral and adorn the tale.

The friar in *Romeo and Juliet* gives us a wealth of wisdom in a single sentence, when, admonishing the love-stricken one, he declares that "Violent passions have violent ends." The colloquy between Hamlet and the ghost serves to explain in a few lines the Catholic doc-

trine of purgatory. It is these and a score of other texts, showing an amazing knowledge of the doctrines and practises of the Church, that have caused more than one investigator to conclude that the immortal bard must have been a Catholic.

It is interesting to note that two of the most successful plays ever written along these lines, "Richelieu" and "Becket," were the work of non-Catholic authors and were produced by non-Catholic actors. Bulwer's picturesque and powerful drama has held the board for more than eighty years now and age has not dulled nor custom staled its infinite variety. It is a well-known fact that at some time in his career every actor has harbored the desire to appear as Hamlet just as every actress has wanted to play Juliet. In the same way most first-class thespians have been irresistibly drawn to Bulwer's Cardinal. In many ways the play is "actor-proof" which is only another way of saying that if the lines are read with any degree of intelligence, the play cannot fail to satisfy. Another fact is that it nearly always draws good houses. Thus Macready, Irving, Booth, Mantell and a score of others have included it in their repertoires with unvarying success.

The scene wherein the Cardinal draws the imaginary circle around the form of Julie, and threatens the "curse of Rome" upon him who dares pass it, though his "head may wear a crown," has evoked the applause and approval of hundreds of thousands of auditors. The lines are effective, not only in a dramatic sense but in an educational way. In those days it was the Church alone that stood against the tyranny of kings and with the people, just as it does today, although under different conditions. The scene also emphasized the right of sanctuary. The sacred precincts of the Church furnished the refuge, the inviolable asylum of the pursued and the persecuted. In this manner the drama of "Richelieu" has gone on for decades, and that scene alone has been as effective as hundreds of sermons and thousands of essays.

Perhaps the most remarkable fact concerning "Richelieu" is that it was written in two weeks. Mr. W. C. Macready, the English actor, had produced the "Lady of Lyons," and it met with such success that he was anxious to get another play from the pen of Sir Edward Bulwer. The poet and novelist was willing, but he could not think of a suitable subject. Writing to a friend at that time he says: "The play stands dead still. Not a subject to be found, though I have read for it like a tiger." But he was nearer to what he wanted than he knew, because on October 24, 1838, Macready writes in his diary: "Received a letter from Bulwer informing me that he has made the rough sketch of a play, an historical comedy, on the subject of Richelieu. I answered him, delighted with the news."

On November 4, Bulwer wrote to Forster: "The children have been with me. We have all been sad truants with balloons and boats, and none of us have done our lessons properly. Nevertheless 'Richelieu' will be given

up to Macready next week." Seven days later he says: "This morning I put the last stroke to 'Richelieu.'" It is needless to say that the first draft of his play was subject to constant revision and that he received valuable assistance from the actor. But the astounding rapidity may be understood when it is stated that this was a five-act play in blank verse. On November 17, Macready writes:

Called on Bulwer and talked over the play of "Richelieu." He combated my objections and acceded to them as his judgment swayed him; but when I developed the object of the whole plan of alterations he was in ecstasies. I never saw him so excited, several times saying he was "enchanted" with the plan, and observed in high spirits "What a fellow you are!" I left him the play and he promised to let me have it in a week! He is a wonderful man.

Within twenty-four hours after this was recorded Bulwer brought back two scenes which had been rewritten and three days later the whole play was completed in the form in which it was desired by the actor. A few nights after this the play was read to a few friends, and on that occasion an incident occurred that was truly laughable. During the reading of the third act Forster fell asleep. Bulwer, like most authors, was very sensitive, and the episode made him furious. The next day Forster wrote a most abject letter of apology. He said that he would not have wounded Bulwer intentionally for worlds. He could "offer no extenuation of this unfortunate matter" and merely wrote to beg forgiveness. Bulwer accepted this in the spirit in which it was written. He could not deny that he was pained, but said the letter of his fellow-worker had removed that impression and substituted one of "unalloyed pleasure and satisfaction."

The play was finally produced at Covent Garden on March 7, 1837, and was well received. Yet the actor was not entirely satisfied because we find in his diary these words:

Acted Richelieu very nervously; lost my self-possession and was obliged to use too much effort; it did not satisfy me at all, there were no artist-like touches through the play. How can a person get up such a play and do justice at the same time to such a character? It is not possible. Was called for and very enthusiastically received; gave out the play for every night. Its success seemed to be unequivocal.

Needless to say Macready succeeded in giving the artist-like touches in subsequent performances, and the run of the play was one of the most notable in the history of the drama. Bulwer wrote many other plays but none of them met with such popular success as that in which the great Cardinal is the chief character. In speaking of it a year or two later he says that it has met with more than ordinary success, and that it appears likely to retain "its hold upon the stage." That sounds quite modest in view of the fact that it can still be depended upon in this year of 1921 to draw well-crowded houses.

In more recent years Henry Irving made a version of Tennyson's work on Thomas à Becket, the great Arch-

bishop of Canterbury, who was so foully murdered in his Cathedral in 1170. In this case the difficulty was to take a bulky work and fit it into the requirements of the modern stage. Bram Stoker, Irving's manager, says that at the time the actor was in just the right mood for a play of this kind. He had been appearing in *Henry VIII*, and the long run with only six performances a week gave him unusual leisure and time for study.

I think, says Stoker, that the character he was playing had its influence with him. He was tuned to sacerdotalism; and the robes of a churchman sat easy on him. There was a sufficient difference between Wolsey, the Chancellor, who happened to be a cleric, and Becket, who was cleric before all things, to obviate the danger of too exact a repetition of character and situation. At all events Irving reasoned it out in his usual quiet way, and did not speak until he was ready. It was during the customary holiday in Holy Week in 1892 that he finally made up his mind.

The story, it seemed, fascinated Irving. The part of Becket appealed to him, and some of the passages greatly moved him. He said it was a true "miracle" play, a holy theme; and that he felt already in studying it that he had been made a better man. It was necessary now to get the permission of Tennyson to make the desired alterations in the play. Bram Stoker was sent to Farringford, the seaside home of the poet, as the ambassador of the actor. To his great delight Tennyson had no objection to having the "cuts" made. Indeed, he seemed to feel proud that Irving had decided to place the story on the stage. There were innumerable conferences, and the slashes that were made in the tragedy would have sorely wounded the pride of a less gifted man. Stoker placed before him Irving's suggestion that he should, if he thought well of it, introduce a speech, or rather amplify the idea conveyed in the shout of the kneeling crowd: "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord! The poet said in a doubting way: "But where am I to get such a speech?"

The diplomatic Stoker pointed to the waves that lashed themselves against the highest cliffs in England: "There it is! In the roar of the sea!"

The result of this was one of the finest passages in the play. As it appeared in the acting version it was as follows:

Hubert. "The voice of the people blesses thee."

Becket. "And I bless

The people, love them, live for them—and yet

Not me, not me! they bless the Church in me.

The Voice of the people goes against the King,

The Voice of the Lord is the Voice of the People!

The Voice of the Lord is in the warring floods,

And He will lead His people into Peace!

The Voice of the Lord will shake the wilderness,

The barren wilderness of unbelief!

The Voice of the Lord will break the cedar trees—

The Kings and Rulers that have closed their ears

Against the Voice—and at their hour of doom

The Voice of the Lord will hush the hounds of Hell

That ever yelp and snarl at Holy Church

In everlasting silence."

The poet had instinctively given the actor just what he

wanted for fine dramatic effect. The whole play illustrates the conflict between Church and State, but this passage emphasized the idea, and lifted the supernatural aspect of the subject into the prominence that was essential to carrying out the main idea of the theme. Those who had the privilege of seeing Irving in this great play will recall the fervor and spirituality which he infused into these lines.

Becket was placed upon the stage on February 6, 1893, which also happened to be Irving's fifty-fifth birthday. It was a complete and enormous success. The people had been waiting at the pit from early morning and the house was crowded. "It was," says Stoker, "a huge personal triumph for Irving." It played 112 times that season, and only ended because of a fire which destroyed the valuable scenery.

"Richelieu" and "Becket" have been cited because they illustrate in a peculiarly striking manner the enormous possibilities of the historical drama with such material. There are other plays quite as famous in their way and dealing with actual happenings. Poetic license is necessary, of course, but generally speaking episodes of the various ages are so rich and colorful that they only need to be adapted to the limitations of the stage. Nor is it necessary to go back for centuries in order to find the dramatic clashes which are the very life of the drama.

One of the memorable conflicts between spiritual authority and the brute force of the State was that of Bismarck and Leo XIII. What wonderful material and characters that contains for the novelist and the playwright! The persecution of the Church in Germany began after the Franco-Prussian War, and ended in 1886. One of the purposes of the long struggle was to separate the Catholic Prussians from the Holy See. The supposedly great German statesman insisted that this was quite feasible. It was just as though a man came up to you and said: "Let me chop your head off; it will be for the good of your body!" Having no desire to commit suicide this invitation was declined by the owners of both head and body.

Bismarck was in the height of his power and his crusade, and that of his "reptile press," against the religious Orders, and the Jesuits particularly, was one of the bitterest in history. The so-called May laws not only suppressed the religious orders but banished their members from the Kingdom. The seminaries were closed, and in a period of eight years practically every Bishop of the diocese along the Rhine Valley had been removed either by death or persecution. So merciless was Bismarck that practically not a vestige of religious liberty remained to nearly 10,000,000 Catholics.

Consider the two leading characters in this remarkable drama. On the one hand we have the "man of blood and iron," who was utterly unscrupulous in trying to accomplish his purpose. Picture a massive person, as "big as a mountain," as he has been described, a man of broad shoulders, thick neck, grisly mustache, bushy

eyebrows and grim, determined look. A man who boasted of having drained a quart of champagne from a loving cup without pausing for breath; a man who would consider six eggs, a beefsteak, fried potatoes, a plate of rye bread, three cups of coffee and a quart of red wine, a "square meal"; imagine him flushed with victory over France, backed by the most powerful army in Europe, aided by a paid and corrupt press and assisted by hundreds of spies, and you get some faint idea of the man and his resources.

Opposed to him in the fight of right against might is a frail man in the Vatican armed only with spiritual weapons. He has often been described: A white ascetic face, a face of alabaster whiteness, almost transparent in its delicacy, eyes all radiant, filled with the fire of piety and fatherly kindness. Add to this a large aquiline nose denoting power and determination. There you have the two leading personages. The one physically strong and boorish, and the other aristocratic, a gentleman to his very finger tips. The power of Bismarck in his kind of statesmanship is not to be discounted, but he was out-matched mentally by the lonely figure in the Vatican. They faced each other, the Pope and the Premier. Bismarck had his legions, but Leo XIII, in addition to his spiritual strength was the head of an organization of which it has been declared "the gates of hell shall not prevail."

The contest begins with a diplomatic note from the Vatican to the Emperor. It evokes a thunderous growl from the burly Chancellor. He will have none of it. "No such disgraceful concession has ever been asked of Germany as the revision of the May laws." Very well. The duel proceeds. Bismarck uses a bludgeon; Leo XIII a rapier. Once again comes a roar from the thick-necked master of modern Germany:

"They say I am going to Canossa! But they are mistaken. I am not going to Canossa!"

But the mistaken one was the man of blood and iron. The contest wages slowly but surely. He breathes heavily. He is losing his false strength drop by drop. The figure in the Vatican is serene and confident. And so it comes about that on May 9, 1886, the Prussian Chamber voted to cancel the most of the anti-Catholic legislation, and its edict is approved by the monarch. Bismarck had gone to Canossa!

And today, in this year of our Lord, 1921, the Empire which he had reared with such infinite pains lies in ruins, while the Church which he thought to destroy exists stronger and greater and more beautiful than ever.

But in our search for the material of which real drama is made we do not have to go back even so far as 1873. It is only necessary to turn to the Great War whose smoldering remains are still to be discerned in Europe. This time we look to Belgium and we see a tall figure, with a thin pale face, asserting the doctrine of right in the teeth of another German, a military dictator with another

great army, trained and tuned to obey the lightest command. The battle between Cardinal Mercier and General von Bissing has already become historic. The conditions are slightly different. Here we have not the ancient clash between the Church and State, but rather a great epic of patriotism. It is a Prince of the Church, standing, with his back to the wall, asserting the rights of the people. When all else had failed this scarlet-clothed figure blocked the path to despotism and wrong.

With German guns glistening on all sides he nevertheless rises to proclaim the doctrine of right and independence. Those immortal words cannot be repeated too often:

A day does not go by [proclaims Cardinal Mercier] without my receiving from friends of all nationalities letters of condolence which invariably terminate with the words, "Poor Belgium!" and I answer. "No, no, not poor Belgium, but great Belgium, incomparable Belgium, heroic Belgium! On the map of the world it is only a tiny spot which many foreigners would never notice without the aid of a magnifying glass; but today there is not a nation in the world which does not render homage to this Belgium."

Everybody knows the outcome of that struggle. Little wonder that this great Cardinal should have been received with frenzied applause by the people of France, England and the United States. Is there drama in this? The question is superfluous. Even the text of a great play is here ready-made in the speeches of Cardinal Mercier. He has even given us the little touches of comedy-relief in the manner in which his pastorals were sent to the outside world by being hidden in huge blocks of Dutch cheese.

The great historical themes almost clamor for attention and treatment. The subjects need not be confined to any country or any century. From the days of the early martyrs down to the present the pages of church history teem with material; we have it in the vandalism and persecution of the Protestant Reformation; we have it in suffering Ireland; we have it in such a clean, wholesome theme as "My New Curate"; we have it in such things as the inviolability of the confessional. Some day we shall have dramatists who will draw from this wonderful storehouse of rich material, and if they build upon a high standard, and give us a truthful and not a distorted representation of history the Faith is not likely to suffer.

Archbishop Kordac of Prague

VERIAN OVECKA, S.J.

ON October 28, 1917, Czechoslovakia regained her liberty. Unfortunately, for many in the new State political liberty meant nothing less than some kind of national church whose privileges and doctrines they themselves were to define and dictate. To others national liberty seemed to imply an opportunity for enslaving the Catholic Church herself. It was certainly a great mis-

fortune that under such circumstances the primatial see of Prague, to say nothing of other bishoprics, became vacant, and remained so until September 16, 1919, when Mgr. Francis Kordac was appointed Archbishop by the Holy See. He was consecrated in his cathedral on October 26, 1919. Thus during one of the most critical years the episcopal body of Czechoslovakia had been without its natural leader and the Catholic people were without that guide whose voice could have spoken with the utmost authority and would have been listened to with the greatest deference. No wonder then that a feeling of depression gradually settled upon the Faithful.

"Mgr. Kordac appointed Archbishop!" When this news spread throughout the streets of Prague joy sparkled in the eyes of the devoted children of the Church and "Thank God" came from their lips. The new Archbishop was too well known for any one not to grasp at once the importance of those words: "Kordac, Archbishop." A man from the people, a priest of exemplary life and absolutely blameless character, an eminent scholar, a renowned preacher and speaker, an excellent organizer, a friend of youth, in a word, a priest according to the heart of God, such was Archbishop Kordac whose hand now firmly held the crozier of St. Adalbert. Well did the Catholics in Prague and throughout the Republic recognize this. It was a happy omen that he should be the first Bishop appointed in the new Republic.

Mgr. Francis Kordac was born at Seletice, in the diocese of Litomerice, on January 11, 1852, a child of simple peasants. His secondary studies were made in the diocesan high school of Bahušedov (Mariaschein), directed by the Society of Jesus. An evidence of his piety during those eight years is the fact that he very soon became a sodalist and almost continuously held the most honorable offices of his sodality. In the record of studies we find him almost invariably at the head of his class.

In 1873 he completed his course with uncommon success. Ferdinand, the last crowned King of Bohemia, who since his abdication in 1848 resided in Prague, and to whom the brilliant student had been presented, granted him a purse for further studies in the German College at Rome. There he stayed for six years, from 1873 to 1879, and returned to his native diocese with his degrees in philosophy and theology. Bishop Frind appointed him, on his return, to a curacy at Liberec (Reichenberg), a German town with a Czech minority. It was a difficult post, but besides his other duties, Father Kordac succeeded in organizing special service for the hitherto neglected Czechs, gave religious instruction in their private schools, and did much for the spiritual development of his parish.

After six years, in 1885, Bishop Schoebl called him to Litomerice to fill the post of a professor of theology and vice-rector of the diocesan seminary. In 1889 he was appointed Rector, and held that position for fifteen years.

The quality of his work as educator and teacher may be gaged by the zealous priests, both Czech and German, trained under his care, who all remember him with gratitude and enthusiastic attachment. He showed, indeed, his true greatness and his religious zeal in rising superior to all racial prejudices. The restoration of the seminary and its church, the establishment of a Catholic boarding house for high-school students at Mlada Boleslav and of a Catholic printing-office at Litomerice and the convoking of the regional Catholic Congress at Turnov, are all works that must be credited to him.

In 1905 he followed the call to the chair of Christian philosophy and apologetics at the Czech University in Prague. His eloquence on the platform and in the pulpit, and his ability as a writer on theological and philosophical questions singled him out as a man of unusual power. To this must be added his exertions on behalf of the Church in political life and especially in the National Assembly of the new Republic. His membership in this body he resigned only after his consecration. Such were the qualifications that made of this austere-looking prelate, always exemplary in his priestly life, a personage so notable in the eyes of all that even his own adversaries looked up to him with undisguised reverence. His grasp of affairs, his prudence and foresight, his discretion and firmness have so far been abundantly shown in the discharge of his duties. In his masterly pastorals and his resistance to the onslaught of the new sect in Czechoslovakia he has fully justified the confidence which the Holy See placed in him, and which it has ever since continued to show him, as Archbishop and Primate.

As regards his private life, Archbishop Kordac, now seventy years of age, lives with his two aged sisters, saintly and devoted persons, who look to the material needs of his household. Another member of this strictly ecclesiastical home is the Papal Nuncio. Archbishop Kordac is no less admirable as a man and a priest, than as a great prelate. He may truly be looked upon as a savior of his country in these afflicted times.

Since April 3, 1921, he has a worthy colleague in Mgr. Stojan, the new Archbishop of Olomuc, the second archiepiscopal see in the Republic. A third one will soon be created in Slovakia. Together, these two great prelates are the pride and hope of Czechoslovakia. Her new liberty was fraught with bitter religious struggles, but with them came also a religious awakening under excellent Bishops sent by Rome. At the time of the declaration of independence, some episcopal sees were vacant and others were soon to become so. The concordat with Austria had passed away with that monarchy and the Holy See was now free in its choice of Bishops for Czechoslovakia. It was henceforth guided by ecclesiastical reasons only, without external political interference. In less than three years, seven out of the present eleven dioceses of the Republic had received new pastors. One Slovakian see has quite recently become vacant by death.

All of these Bishops are men of exemplary life, able and zealous prelates, loved and trusted by their flocks. Under such leadership Catholic life, roused to action by persecution, is steadily progressing. Judicious observers declare that the present struggle will eventually be accounted as not too great a price to have been paid for the beneficent results of the new Catholic awakening. Much, of course, still remains to be done and to be overcome, before its full effects can be happily secured.

COMMUNICATIONS

Letters as a rule should not exceed six hundred words.

Soldiers and Chapels

To the Editor of AMERICA:

In AMERICA for July 2, 1921, I read with righteous irritation and resentment, in the communication of Elizabeth M. Ralph, how unfairly and unjustly the Catholics of Fort Stanton, New Mexico, were treated. From her letter I understand that Catholics did what the Government wouldn't do for Catholic soldiers that were giving their services to the Government, viz., bought and equipped a portable chapel, got a license for this edifice from the then Secretary of the Treasury, McAdoo, and secured as chaplain the Rev. Gerald Gay of New York. But under the plea of economy, she tells us, Secretary Houston had all the chaplains removed from the hospital. In reference to this, permit me to say that such an act of injustice is not only a stain on the Secretary who perpetrated it, but also on the President that appointed him. Both President and Secretary should be reminded that the preamble to the Constitution states that the object of our union under a Government is to promote justice, and that acts of injustice are violations of the very object for which we formed this Government. If the Government has a right to compel Catholics to enter the army and do its fighting, then Catholics have a right to demand justice of the Government. Moreover, a government that would threaten to break off diplomatic relations with Russia in order to protect the Jews of Russia from persecution by their own Government, ought certainly to have enough respect for its own citizens to see that they get justice. Be it said too with emphasis that confiscating their chapel, bought and equipped with Catholic money, and depriving soldiers of the spiritual consolations of their religion, is a rank, rank piece of injustice that every Catholic worthy of the name should resent and so far as they are able protest. Praise to Elizabeth M. Ralph for exposing it.

Oil Center, Cal.

P. A. McANDREW.

The Bonus Problems

To the Editor of AMERICA:

It is with much dismay that I read in AMERICA for July 9, under the caption "The Federal Bonus Bill," your justification of "Corporal" Tanner's attack on the adjusted compensation plan. How easy it is to dig up a Tanner when an attack is really intended rather than a justification of an attack. Then as a justification you bring forth a lot of grossly misleading and erroneous statements.

For a starter you head your article "The Federal Bonus Bill." That is wrong. It is not a bonus bill but a plan to adjust the pay received by the ex-service man while he was with the colors. You could refer to the bill giving a gratuity to Federal employes, who have already received large salaries, other than the soldier, but you wrongly named the one in question. Then, "In its present form, this measure proposes to donate a sum of money to every soldier," say you. Again misleading. Does not the

bill propose other and more worthy things? After this you make a statement that seems to have been copied from somewhere else for you certainly never arrived at it mathematically. "But in the aggregate, these allotments may reach as high as five billion dollars." If every veteran would choose the cash compensation feature the total amount collectible is \$1,547,904,395. Do you mean then that it would take \$3,452,095,605 for its distribution? How preposterous!

You are wise enough not to argue against the justice of this measure but like all other "friends" of the ex-service man you cry about "wrecking the business of the country" and "How is this money to be obtained?" Let me quote to you a report of a sub-committee of the Senate Finance Committee:

Without attempting the allotment of any prospective receipts, but merely as a suggestion of one means of meeting the obligation of this measure, the committee beg to remind the Senate that they will undoubtedly be funded into long-time bonds [the debts due this country for money advanced our associates in the World War]. The Allies, having now agreed with Germany upon the amount of reparations to be paid by Germany to them, will be in position to use the fund received in reparations to meet the interest on their obligations to the United States. The interest on these bonds will, in our opinion, more than care for the payments necessary each year to meet the requirements of this proposed legislation.

Would you accept this as a solution?

Now we get the old smoke screen. Fight the adjusted compensation from behind a screen of "help the disabled first," are the orders. Play on the sympathies of the people. It can't be done because the disabled men themselves have blown the smoke screen away. The money and legislation have been and are being provided for the disabled soldier, but their problem is to have a proper force for the handling of these problems. The physically and mentally disabled veterans are linked arm in arm to help their financially disabled comrades receive what a host of profit-swollen patriots have stolen from them. Your "next step" about helping the disabled is in the rear, that step has been taken long ago.

What am I to think of AMERICA from now on? Here I have been placing implicit faith all along in what I have read in it, and knew nothing about, only to find when I come to something with which I am familiar that it is a complete lie.

Rochester, N. Y.

TERENCE E. O'DONNELL.

[Our correspondent has every claim to be heard. But he has misapprehended a paragraph written to stress the obligation which the Government has to him and his fellows. The plain argument of the editorial criticised is that Federal funds should be used "to devise a plan to put these disabled men in a way of earning their own living. They should not be made the objects of a cheap political 'charity.' They have a real claim upon the country which they have served so faithfully." The editorial then argues that whatever money the Government may be able to raise for this purpose should be distributed for rehabilitation work, according to need, under a system utterly divorced from "red-tape and politics."

In its estimate of what Mr. O'Donnell styles "a plan to adjust the pay" of the soldiers and sailors in the late war, AMERICA may have been in error; this, however, does not justify an accusation of lying and deliberate misrepresentation. Mr. O'Donnell himself by stating that the bill contains "a cash compensation clause" admits that it is in substance a "bonus bill." The cost of the plan was taken from an estimate submitted by the Secretary of the Treasury to the President, and by him to Congress. True, a sub-committee ventured to "suggest" that when Germany makes payment to the Allies the Allies may possibly settle their financial obligations to us, thereby meeting the costs. Apart from the fact that this plan is merely "sug-

gested," and *not* generally accepted as a practicable measure, it is too much an uncertain thing of the future to afford the relief imperatively needed at present. Finally, it cannot be denied that the problem has thus far been grievously mishandled by the Government. That is why the editorial was written.—ED. AMERICA.]

The Interest Problem

To the Editor of AMERICA:

In his letter appearing in AMERICA of July 23, Dr. Ryan says: "If he [the writer] wishes to call the non-rational factor the principal cause of the product and the human factor the instrumental cause, I have no objection." He should have no objection because the matter depends entirely on circumstances. A farm is non-rational, and produces wheat, a sheep is non-rational and produces wool; a worker is rational and yet if he is constantly under the guidance and influence of his employer, he is properly called an instrumental cause. The occasion of my distinction was the Doctor's assertion that owners' goods are the instrumental cause of the product, an assertion which would make the worker a principal cause and give him an unfounded claim to the product. Socialists give the worker an inalienable right to demand a part of the gain received from a business. The owner's goods or property may be the principal or material cause; occasionally they are the instrumental cause of the product, but he alone has a right to the product; the worker hires out his services and has a right to a just compensation.

The Doctor is vigorous in his repudiation of the argument that the ownership of the cause includes that of the effect; he calls it "a bald assertion," "fertile and gratuitous." It may give him a little shock to learn that it is the argument of the illustrious Liberatore, who also declares that to deny the right of rent is to deny the right of property. It is implicitly contained in the axiom "a thing fructifies to its owner," an axiom held sacrosanct by all moralists without exception. "This," says Noldin, "follows immediately from the notion of ownership, for if the whole substance of a thing belongs to the owner and should serve to his advantage, the fruits which are born of it also go to the owner." Hence, I believe, the Doctor's difficulty goes back to the question of ownership.

What is ownership? "The right to possess a thing as belonging exclusively to one's self, and of disposing of it as one wishes." If I have 1,000 acres and can cultivate only 10, I am still proprietor, he says, because I can give away the 990 acres remaining, or lease them gratis. What sort of ownership is this where I cannot dispose of a thing as I wish? The Doctor continues: "When he [the writer] says that this restriction [to personal use] is impracticable, he uses the only method whereby the legitimacy of interest-taking can be proved or disproved. It is the method which determines property rights in the light of human welfare. For human welfare is the sole end and determinant of all property rights." The end of property right is not human welfare but the good of the individual. I do not secure a house or a farm for human welfare in general but for my own welfare. Inasmuch as it includes the exclusion of others, my ownership is in a sense opposed to the welfare of others; it is a limitation of their rights. It is through the individual benefit that any benefit to society, peace and order, are derived, as St. Thomas says.

In his article of the same issue Dr. Ryan repeats the same principle as the determinant of how far the State can go in taking over private property. Human welfare, he says, is the determinant. This statement is very inaccurate and decidedly Socialistic. My property belongs to me not as a citizen but as a man, and no one but God may take it away. The only exception is where the imperative needs of the community require it, but even then I must be indemnified; the common welfare is

not a reason, hence great authorities like Cathrein reject the expression "eminent domain" as false and misleading.

The writer suggested that the forcible restriction of interest would result in the abrogation of the benefits of capital to arts, sciences and industry. "Progress in civilization," says the last-mentioned author, "is possible only when many cooperate in large and far-reaching enterprises; but this cooperation is out of the question unless there are many who possess more than is required for their ample maintenance. . . . If we recall the extensive net-work of railroads, steamship lines, telegraphs, and telephones . . . we must confess that private property is a powerful and necessary factor in civilization." Voluntary renunciation of interest, the Doctor writes, is a vain hope and he doubts if the State by its action could enforce unwilling surrender. Yet he persists in maintaining that it would be greatly beneficial to human welfare.

"The fact," he further continues, "that the State permits him [the capitalist] to do so [to take interest] is not *per se* a justification any more than State toleration of acts which are certainly immoral." First, no one has suggested that the right of interest is derived from the State. Secondly, there is no parity between good and bad acts. A son is not justified in doing anything manifestly wrong because his father permits it, but he is justified in doing an indifferent or good act under similar conditions. The State has the right to regulate by law questions of property right and interest, where these are left undetermined by the law of nature, and subjects are bound in conscience to obey.

"Father Judge has failed to refer me to moralists who have given the question adequate discussion." All moralists have given the question sufficient consideration, and Dr. Pallen well says that a little example "reduces to its evident absurdity the contention that personal operation is the sole title to the usufruct. The exercise of a little common sense in a concrete illustration clearly shows that interest is not only morally, economically and socially justifiable, but necessary in any civilized society."

New York.

H. A. JUDGE, S.J.

Stupid British Propaganda

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Referring to your editorial of July 16, which was rightly entitled "Stupid English Propaganda," and dealt with the infelicitous citation by the *New York Times* of the Declaration of Independence as authority for the statement that our enemy in 1776 was not Great Britain but simply George III, permit me to call attention to the fact, readily ascertainable from any accurate work on the Revolution, that, in the latter phase of the protest of the Colonies against the exercise of the taxing power by the British Parliament, they had been forced to assume the position that America was independent of Parliament and that the only bond of union existing between England and the Colonies was a common king. Consequently, the patriot leaders in framing the Declaration of Independence were mainly intent on setting forth sufficient aggressions on the part of the British monarch to justify them in asserting that he by his tyrannous conduct had absolved them from their allegiance to the "British Crown" and thus severed the only connection between England and America. As they had already denied the jurisdiction of Parliament, the representative of the British people, it would have been illogical for them to have stressed the wrongs inflicted on them by that body. Nevertheless, as any historical tyro well knows, the Revolutionary struggle was in fact a conflict between the Colonies and the British Parliament, and in the contest, Parliament had the support of the King and the overwhelming popular approval of the English people.

Tulsa.

HORACE H. HAGAN.

A M E R I C A

A · CATHOLIC · REVIEW · OF · THE · WEEK

SATURDAY, August 6, 1921

Entered as second-class matter, April 15, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at Special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103. Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

Published weekly by The America Press, New York.
President, RICHARD H. TIERNEY; Secretary, JOSEPH HUSSLEIN;
Treasurer, FRANCIS A. BREEN.

SUBSCRIPTIONS, POSTPAID:

United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00
Canada, \$4.50 - - - Europe, \$5.00

Address:

THE AMERICA PRESS, 173 East 83d Street, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.

CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW

Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

The New Archbishop of Baltimore

A LAS for the ruthlessness of science. The scholars will no longer permit us to say or to think that St. Brendan discovered America. The story has been swept into the archives of "historical romance," and the existence of "Greater Ireland," south of the Chesapeake Bay, has been relegated out of the region of fact into the land of myth. Be this as it may, it is undoubtedly true that another voyager from the land of the Saint has crossed the seas, and after having ruled the land once said to have been colonized by St. Brendan, has been named, in this year of high hope for Ireland's national regeneration, to preside over the destinies of the mother diocese of the United States.

Baltimore, with the broadness that was characteristic of the Maryland colony, has been cosmopolitan in her Archbishops. The founder of the archdiocese was of American birth, as was his immediate successor and also the majority of the prelates who have governed this illustrious see; but Archbishop Maréchal was a Frenchman, Archbishop Whitfield was born in England, Archbishop Kenrick came from Ireland. Irish blood flowed in the veins of John Carroll, Irish blood and Irish education were the privilege of Cardinal Gibbons, Irish faith and Irish birth, in the very heart of Ireland, are the proud possessions of Archbishop Curley.

The latest incumbent of the diocese that once was commensurate with the entire United States is a son of the College of Mungret. The names of its alumni are familiar to those acquainted with the great deeds being wrought for God and country in this land of ours; one cannot but recall, however, in connection with the appointment of Archbishop Curley, that the Bishops of Detroit, Buffalo and Springfield, distinguished types of American energy and progress, all drew their inspira-

tion from that same little nursery of apostolic zeal, close to the city of Limerick. Mungret has reason to be proud of what it has done and is doing for the Church in America. Archbishop Curley is young, vigorous, fearless, aggressive and progressive, a man of deep learning and simple piety, a scholar and an eloquent preacher. His many and varied gifts argue well for the future of the illustrious see to which he has been called, and the exalted traditions of his brilliant predecessors are safe in his holy hands.

Supergovernments

THE fear of a supergovernment led the American people to reject the League of Nations. They believed in the government handed down to them, considered it capable of solving domestic questions and of dealing with problems that bore upon international relations. So they could have nothing to do with a League that threatened to curtail national prerogatives. No outside power was to take the place of a power from within and tell these United States to follow this or that line of domestic or foreign policy. These were in brief the American arguments against the League that the diplomats set up in Paris.

While the danger of a foreign supergovernment was beaten back by the results of a national election, there is every reason to fear a trend in national legislation to outlaw the Constitution and set up in its stead bureaus with supergovernmental powers. Witness the drift of educational legislation. Illiteracy frightens some well-meaning legislators and at once they start about creating a bureau in Washington that will wield the very effective weapon of Federal gold to curtail the power of the individual States to control education. "Conform to our educational program or you will not get a cent of the Federal appropriation for your schools." This is government by bureaucracy however noble its purpose may be. Yet the educational bureaucrats are mild in comparison with the legislators who are behind the Sheppard maternity bill. For if it becomes law it will centralize in the Children's Bureau in Washington full power to direct the care of maternity and infancy. It will have committees in every locality without limit of number or membership. (Section 4, S1039.)

The Massachusetts Civic Alliance very pointedly declares:

The Sheppard maternity bill is the more dangerous because of what it does not say. It gives blanket powers to the Children's Bureau and to its chief. It gives the power to form a vast machine, spreading its net over the American people. She is to be financed by \$1,480,000, and every year by one million more. This money is not to be used in providing a bed for a mother nor a bottle of milk for a baby, but in organization, administration and propaganda.

This powerful machine can be used in securing salaries; also wages for mothers and support for children until of age.

The Soviet feature of the Sheppard maternity bill exceeds in importance the strong medical and social objections. It gives one woman supreme authority from the Atlantic to the Pacific and the Gulf to the Lakes.

Old-fashioned Americanism jealously guarded individual rights. It ever kept in mind the essential American principle that government had those powers only that were given to it to secure the common good and help the individual. But to invade the school and dictate in the home was never thought to be the function of government or any bureau created by government. That is the theory not of American government but of supergovernment. And the powers outlined in the Sheppard maternity bill simply turn a government bureau into a supergovernment. Whatever it may be called, it is not American.

Christianity's Alleged "Failure"

FOR the last half-dozen years the favorite occupation of a certain kind of publicists seems to have been sadly discussing the failure of Christianity to find a remedy for the many evils that have befallen the world. "Is our present condition the result of preaching the Gospel for nearly two thousand years?" they ask. "Why didn't the churches prevent, or at least stop, the Great War?" In an essay called "Christianity and Its Critics" forming part of a remarkable book entitled "Excursions in Thought," written by an anonymous Irishman, there is a very effective refutation of the age-old charges against Christianity which have first been warmed over and then urged as if fresh and new by the unbelievers of today. The Church's critics, "Imaal" shows, blame her for not doing what it was never her Divine Founder's purpose that she should do. Yet Christianity would have great success, no doubt, in solving many of the social and industrial problems of today if only it were tried. It is unjust to charge with failure an institution that has not been permitted to attempt a cure of the modern world's ills, because those chiefly responsible for them refuse to listen to the Church's suggestions. Then "Imaal" contrasts the shining success of the Church's real object, the salvation of souls, with the confessed failure of other religious systems to satisfy the needs of human nature. Finally to meet the well-worn objection that all "thinking men" are non-Christians, the author well observes:

If such men of science as Herschell, Sir Humphrey Davy, Faraday, Sir David Brewster, Ampère, Ohm, Pasteur, Mendel and Branly, and such thinkers as Pascal, De Maistre, Balmez, Görres and Newman, and such critics as La Harpe, Schlegel and Brunetière accepted Christianity, it is at least as much entitled to its freedom as any form of skepticism. The gate of the dock must be opened, and the word failure no longer hurled at Christianity. However changed from the greatest days of its temporal power the Church may now appear, it is still by incomparable odds the largest and most notable of purely voluntary organizations, and the only one, voluntary or other, that is universal. What voluntary organization begotten by negativism can compare with it either in its long historic record, or its world-width of expansion? Certainly Lucretius, earnest poet that he was, and frank denier of all gods, begot no such institution; neither did any other skeptic, ancient or modern. Voltaire did not give rise to any voluntary organization that has survived and become world-wide, and a sure instinct tells us that the Nietzschean philosophy will not create any such. Here is at once the glory and the difficulty of Christianity, that while it offers the skeptic

a living institution to assail or undermine, and a record of twenty centuries to ransack for flaws and lapses, negativism on the other hand offers the Christian philosopher no voluntary organization of world-width, and of even a century's record, upon which he can make reprisals. But we are proud of our disadvantage; may it last forever! The extinction of Christianity is the only thing that could give a real victory to the skeptic, and he knows that he will never see it.

When post-Christian negativism has lasted two thousand years or so, has spread throughout the civilized world, has faced and solved but one-tenth of the problems which the Church has so bravely met and settled during her long career, and when the world has had a line of negativist leaders whose words and deeds will bear any comparison whatever with those of St. Peter and his successors, then and only then, can men of common sense begin to discuss the "failure of Christianity" and decide whether the guerdon of success should be awarded to triumphant negativism or to the Church of the Ages.

That Prussian, von Steuben!

ALONG the Atlantic sea-board, the July weather was almost hot enough to excuse any mental breakdown. But only an extreme phase of midsummer madness can account for the inhabitants of a small town in New Jersey who recently declared war on the memory of a great figure in the American Revolution, Baron von Steuben. The schoolboard had agreed to give his name to a new schoolbuilding, when a faction rose up with the belated information that von Steuben was a German. Worse, he was a Prussian, and by the fact utterly unfit to be held up to young Americans as a guide, philosopher or friend. No other charges were made against the absent hero, but the board yielded before the storm as von Steuben never did.

One wonders how von Steuben's companions in arms would have rated this proceeding. Von Steuben was a German, it is true, but in turning a crowd of farmers into an army, at a time when the backbone of the forces needed stiffening, he did a work that was beyond all price. Washington probably knew that he was a Prussian, but Washington welcomed him as a skilful soldier and found him a congenial companion and a faithful friend, at a period when the Commander-in-Chief needed loyal followers. Franklin, too, knew his worth; Congress thought enough of his services to vote him a pension; more than one State made him a grant of land; and among the first Americans, he was, for all his strictness, something of a popular hero. But he is not good enough to have his name written over the door of a public school.

While the war lasted a certain allowance could be made for hysteria, both among the little great men at Washington and among the populace. But the war is now over, and it is high time to return to the President's beloved "normalcy." We may love the Germans and the Prussians neither more nor less than we did before 1914, but we can now refuse to admit, without peril to

our loyalty, that to call a man a German is final proof that he is a villain.

Dr. Tigert's Conclusions

FROM the mistakes of Judge Towner, the new Commissioner of Education, Dr. J. J. Tigert, has reaped a certain degree of caution. It was the Judge who in more than one impassioned oration for the Smith-Towner Federal education bill, was wont to exclaim: "These statistics put us in ninth place among the nations, with most of the civilized world ahead of us." The statistics in question did nothing of the sort. On their face they showed that we were less illiterate than France, Belgium, Italy, Spain, and Canada; but the Bureau of the Census from which the figures emanated, printed a warning that the statistics were not always "strictly comparable," for the very good reason that the basis of computation was not uniform. They might have indicated that the United States was tenth or twelfth or eighth or fourth, as well as ninth, for they were wholly inconclusive. But Judge Towner did not trouble himself to repeat the warning of the Census Bureau, and an examination to which "these statistics" were submitted in AMERICA for April 9, 1921, showed them to be worthless as a basis of accurate comparison. Dr. Tigert returns to the old charge, but from a different angle. He does not deal in unsatisfactory figures, but, as reported by the *New York Evening Post*, states in simple terms, "The United States alone of all the great Powers shows a high degree of illiteracy."

Let us rank Great Britain, Japan, Italy, France, and the United States as the "great Powers." No illiteracy figures for Japan seem to be available, and while the re-

turns recently furnished by the Bureau of Education are vague and unsatisfactory, they certainly do not bear out Dr. Tigert's remarkable statement. Great Britain shows up well with an illiteracy percentage of but 1.0, a conclusion reached by an examination of the army recruits for 1903. As to Italy, the marriage-records for 1910 state that 24.8 of the men and 36.3 of the women were illiterate. In France, the figures for 1910 indicate an illiteracy of 14.1. For the same year, the percentage in the United States was 7.7. In other words, leaving out Japan for which no figures are at hand, the United States has the smallest percentage of illiteracy of all the great Powers, except one!

But Dr. Tigert has another conclusion, no less startling. Germany led the world in literacy, and Germany, he argues, "demonstrated during the war the power of education." Hence

It would be a crime to pit our army, in the condition it was as to illiteracy in 1917, against a highly educated army like that of Germany.

Yet the same figures seem to indicate that France, Belgium and the United States "demonstrated during the war the power of illiteracy." For with illiteracy records of 14.1, 12.7 and 7.7 respectively, they seem to have conquered Germany whose rating was 0.05, and Prussia where illiteracy had approached the vanishing-point of 0.02. Figures are elusive guides, and Dr. Tigert will do well to eschew them. The real question, as Bryce well observes in his latest book, is not how much illiteracy hurts good government and a people's progress, but how much each is helped by what in these days we call education.

Literature

THE WHITE-ROBED LYRIST OF NOTRE DAME

VISCONT DE CHATEAUBRIAND'S "*Le Génie du Christianisme*" and "*Les Martyrs*" had a providential mission. The first was published on that historic Easter Day of 1802, when Napoleon Bonaparte, as First Consul, restored religious worship to France, at peace at last after the orgies of the Revolution. The second appeared in 1809 when the Emperor had reached the pinnacle of his glory. In spite of the moral shortcomings of the writer and of the palpable defects of the "*Génie*" and of the subsequent epic, it is doubtful if any other argument or any other author could then have wrought the same beneficial results. Chateaubriand may be called a restorer. He made religion at least respectable and fashionable. A mediocre philosopher, he did not use at all, or, clumsily, at best, the well-stocked arsenal of arms which science, reason, faith and history place at the disposal of the Catholic apologist. But he knew his times. He had suffered from the religious, philosophic and social unrest, which had tortured his countrymen. The psychology and mental characteristics of his age were familiar to him. He sounded the exact note needed to rouse them from their Voltairian skepticism. In spite of their lacunae and exotic flavor, the "*Génie*" and the "*Martyrs*" carried their lesson to a scoffing century. The men he addressed would not have listened to a closely reasoned apology of Christianity. They listened to esthetic and emotional arguments brought forward in its defense in language whose romantic

imagery and splendor of diction inaugurated a new era in French literature.

In the very year that saw the "*Génie du Christianisme*" winning back thousands of Frenchmen to something like respect for the old Faith, Jean-Baptiste-Henri Lacordaire, the second founder of the Order of St. Dominic in France and the restorer of French pulpit eloquence, was born amid the hills of Burgundy, not far from the spot where two other great orators, Bernard of Clairvaux and Bossuet, had first seen the light of day. He was the child of his age. Like Chateaubriand he stumbled in the darkness of its intellectual doubts and did not escape unwounded from its moral weaknesses. But his chivalrous nature would not be satisfied either with shreds of truth or the commonplace virtues of an age wearied of strife and yet too cowardly to stifle its primary cause, the selfish indulgence of its own passions. Natures like this do nothing by halves. When wearied of the world and of his own unrest young Lacordaire entered the seminary of St. Sulpice, he dedicated his life and his talents to the service of Christ unreservedly. Admirable as he found the example of the noble priests who trained him in the sacred sciences, he looked for more militant methods in the fight for truth. His temperament demanded a closer contact in the apostles of the Word of God, with the spirit and the ideals of the age. Could liberty, the flaming word on the lips of the men around him, be pictured the child of the Catholic Church, its excesses eliminated and its false claims rejected,

while its legitimate aspirations were placed in their true light; could it be reconsecrated to the noble uses to which the Church had applied it, Abbé Lacordaire felt after his ordination to the priesthood in 1827, that he might become the herald of a program thus outlined. The Church the protector of liberty, the source and cause of the moral greatness of individuals and nations; the old Church persecuted by the civilizations of the past, deemed by them to have been annihilated, yet rescuing them from ruin when they were tottering to their fall; the Church encrimsoned with the blood of martyrs in Rome, and within their memory in their own Paris, and saving Rome, and destined to save France. That would be his theme. It was a timely, dramatic yet simple program. Institutions and men needed a regeneration. The Catholic Church alone could bring it about. Henri Lacordaire preached this program in the press and the pulpit for a lifetime.

Associated for a while with the Abbé de Lamennais in *L'Avenir*, that journal of meteoric splendors when it first blazed across the skies of French Catholic journalism, and then of tragic failure, Lacordaire showed as a journalist the power, eloquence and grasp of the problems and the mentality of his age, which he displayed in the pulpit of Notre Dame. When the Abbé de Lamennais, the man who might have been a second Bossuet, chose rather to play the part of a petty *condottiere* levying treasonable war against his former chiefs, Lacordaire regretfully left the banner of the able but misguided leader under whom he had learned the tactics of the apologist.

After a first oratorical triumph at the Collège Stanislas before the young men of the capital, he was appointed by Mgr. de Quélen, Archbishop of Paris, to the pulpit of Notre Dame. The appointment amounted in reality to his nomination as public and official apologist of the Catholic Faith in France. It was a dangerous and difficult post. Such a position had never been held in France before, although Bishop de Frayssinous had under the Empire, before a less representative audience, attempted a similar but less momentous undertaking. To these Conferences, which with interruptions lasted from 1835 to 1851, the leaders of the intellectual, political, artistic, literary and social life of France and the capital flocked in undiminished crowds. They became the admirers, the friends, the converts of this new apostle. Yet Lacordaire preached old truths. For ten years he spoke of the Church, its teaching, the effect of that teaching on the mind and soul of man, on society. Before free thinkers and free livers, he was not afraid to speak as Paul had done before Felix and Drusilla, "of justice, and chastity and of the judgment to come." He painted in words, the magic of which even the coldest Voltairian never forgot, the Person of Christ, God's tender dealings with man, man's fall through his own folly and pride, his reparation through the glories, the power and grace of the Incarnation.

Lacordaire knew very well that to men who had lived through the Revolution and had been steeped in the sophisms of the Encyclopedists, of Rousseau and Voltaire, to a generation wearied of "old formulas" and "old doctrines," he had to speak a new message. He never disgraced the Catholic pulpit by preaching ought else but Christ Crucified. But he preached in a manner suited to the new times and the new thought. The priest of St. Sulpice, the white-robed son of Dominic preached as only a pupil of the disciples of D'Olier and de Gusman could. The Catholic doctrine in all its purity and integrity came triumphantly from his lips. But he threw aside the older molds into which Bossuet, Bourdaloue and Massillon had cast their discourses. His age had witnessed the dawn and sunburst of the romantic movement. Chateaubriand, Lamartine, Victor Hugo, Schiller, Walter Scott, and their imitators had given more freedom to poetry and romance. With an originality and daring equal to his success, Lacordaire gave more freedom to the sacred Word. He carried romanticism into the pulpit. But it was one worthy

of an apostle. Set exordiums, formal and geometrically-patterned divisions, closely-packed syllogisms and subtle distinctions were thrown away. There was no dress parade of oratorical units, no marching and counter-marching. But there was color, swing, freedom, movement, buoyancy, life. Hundreds in his audience had fought in the armies of the Revolution and in the imperial regiments at Wagram and Waterloo. He fought the enemies of truth as recklessly and as gallantly as they had fought the adversaries of France. Like Kellermann or Napoleon he selected the strongest of his opponents and hurled all his powers against him. He redoubles blow upon blow. His are the *gaudia certaminis*. He joys in battle. He trumpets victory even before the fight is well begun. He knows he is right. His cause is just, it cannot fail. It is the cause of the Christ that loved the Franks, of the Church that saved humanity, that made France so glorious in the days of its fidelity to its olden trust. There is a knightly daring in his onset. He appeals to the honor of his hearers, their ideals, their love of liberty and justice. They are Frenchmen. So is he, even though he wears a Dominican's robe. They hate tyranny. The Church of which he is the priest condemns, scorns, hates it no less than they. The friends of Ireland especially will never forget his splendid eulogy of Daniel O'Connell. Science to his audience is dear, their watchword. So is it dear, so has it ever been, so shall it be the watchword, he replies, of the Church of Aquinas and Descartes and Bossuet. We want progress, enlightenment, liberty, the triumph of the democratic ideal, his hearers tell him. These answers the preacher, the Catholic Church will give you.

Lacordaire read and spoke the thoughts of his hearers. In this lay his power. In this lay the power of Paul at Ephesus and Jerusalem, and before the wise men of the Areopagus. The great Dominican identified himself with all that was best in his audience. He was one of them. With them and for them, he fought the battles of liberty, progress and humanity. He made their weaknesses and prejudices stepping-stones to the altar on which he would enshrine the image of Christ in their souls. From these, Christ had long been absent. After a steady assault of years, during which he used all the resources of his intellect, his heart, his poet's fancy and imagination, his triumph as an orator and far more as an apostle came, when after one of the most thrilling outbursts in all the history of eloquence, the majestic hymn to the Sacred Person of Christ beginning with the words: "*Ily'a un homme dont l'amour garde la tombe*": "There is a Man over whose tomb Love keeps watch," he saw proud heads bowed and prouder hearts melted to tears of sorrow and faith at that Sacred Name, which alone can save and redeem, but which too many had forgotten and some blasphemed. That was the climax in the career of the great Dominican. That triumphal hour was dedicated to his Lord and Master. Eloquence and faith then had their reward in the loving victory he won over the sons of the Revolution and the disciples of Voltaire, the prodigals old and young, who with bowed heads and streaming eyes sat electrified and spellbound at the feet of the inspired Lyrist of Notre Dame. JOHN C. REVILLE, S.J.

BENEDICITE!

May you have eyes that always see
A faithful friend in every tree;

A heart, that watching, feels and knows
The living glory of a rose;

And ears that laugh to hear the call
Of startled raindrops as they fall;

May you have feet that joy to fare
Down paths where new-born violets stare;

And hands you would not stain to slay
Or bird or beast on holiday.

Be kind to poor, dumb things; you can,
In truth, then be a friend of man.

And He, who made star, sea and sod,
Will hold you then a friend of God.

J. CORSON MILLER.

REVIEWS

Ariosto, Shakespeare and Corneille. By BENEDETTO CROCE. Translated by DOUGLAS AINSLIE. New York: Henry Holt & Co.

It is not always possible to agree with the educational theories or the philosophical principles of Benedetto Croce. When his philosophy does not directly influence his literary appreciations, he is invigorating and instructive. More than any other European author, with the exception of George Brandes perhaps, he recalls the acumen and genius of Sainte-Beuve. But while the French critic confined himself to a close study of the man, the race and the *milieu*, the Italian critic digs deeper into the laws of esthetics. For Signor Croce the good is the beautiful. The two are identified. A pragmatist, he does not forget to apply the element of usefulness. The good, the beautiful, the useful. These three form a harmonious unity. The bare statement of this theory is sufficient to show to what abuses it is liable.

Signor Croce as a philosophical guide must be constantly watched. Much of his criticism is of course tinged by his pragmatic principles. But not a few of his really discriminating judgments can be accepted. English readers acquainted with the work of Ariosto, especially with the "Orlando Furioso," will agree with the general verdict passed upon it by Signor Croce. Two of his judgments, especially will linger in the memory. Ariosto is the "poet of harmony," of harmony developed in a particular world of sentiments." He sang in masterly fashion of knights and knightly deeds and high emprise because there was the spirit of knighthood in his soul. There was harmony between him and his theme. Substantially this is true. If there be a poet of antiquity whom he resembles it is Ovid who was a splendid story-teller, but lacking in religious feeling and attracted to his mythological fables solely by their beauty and variety. But Ovid had not a delicate taste in art. He "improvised and overflowed owing to his incapacity for firm design and lack of control." In these respects Ariosto is his superior. Ariosto did not improvise. He constantly used the file. He is always unrheterical and conversational. While absorbed in his story he tells it with reserve and with full mastery of the subject.

In dealing with Shakespeare Signor Croce studies, among other topics, Shakespearean sentiment, the motives and development of Shakespeare's poetry, his art, Shakespearean criticism and finally "Shakespeare and ourselves." The chapters dealing with the English poet are not the best in the book. They are surpassed by those given to old Pierre Corneille. The pages given to this great dramatist, the author of that fine "quadrilateral" "Le Cid," "Horace," "Cinna," "Polyeucte" are perhaps the finest in the volume. Signor Croce understands both the greatness and the weaknesses of Corneille. He sees in his dramas the victory of will and reason over the deceptions and tyrannies of the senses and the passions. He realizes the splendor and virility of his verse, just as he deplors his lack of constructive skill, and variety. Corneille, Signor Croce proves, is an incomplete genius. But at his best, the sturdy old Rouen bard strikes a martial note, unsurpassed on the French stage. He is the teacher of the austere virtues, of patriotism, the spirit of self-control, of duty. The Jesuit masters of Pierre Corneille had drilled him in Roman history, the epics of the lives of the Saints; they had also managed to teach him Spanish. He showed that he had not forgotten their lessons and the "Cid," "Cinna," "Sertorius," and "Polyeucte" were his thank-offerings to his old masters. Teachers have seldom been better

rewarded. The Cornelian "quadrilateral," "Rodogune," "Heraclius," enriched French letters with some of its noblest masterpieces.

J. C. R.

The Labor Movement. By FRANK TANNENBAUM. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

This book is well worth reading. It is written by a man who has watched the labor movement from the inside and it shows thought and originality. The author is very frank in his interpretations and straightforward in his conclusions. From an analysis of the work and methods of organized labor he concludes that the inevitable outcome will be the replacement of the capitalist system by industrial democracy. In the author's opinion, every time a new member is brought into a union a step forward is taken in the upsetting of the present system. For the new recruit is taught the value of organization, he learns the views of other men, and is imbued with a new "social-mindedness." Despite defeats and suffering, labor has made great advances and in every country today it must be reckoned with by governments. Indeed Mr. Tannenbaum holds that a world-revolution is already in progress and organized labor is its mouthpiece.

Instead of political organization, he believes that social organization will rule the world, different groups of society will be the substitutes for congress and parliament and they will be much more representative of their constituencies than our present political office-holders are, for they will be selected on account of their special knowledge of the industries they represent. The reader will find that representation is accorded in the main to hand-workers, but artists, scientists and teachers will also represent their respective groups. "It must always be remembered that this is a co-operative industrial democracy with the interest of the community always and primarily the first consideration." Starving Russian artists, however, and a well-fed Red Army make a very strong argument against the Tannenbaum industrial commonwealth.

In analyzing the differences between radical and conservative labor, in picking the flaws in the present capitalist system the author has substantially contributed to social thought but in outlining his government of the future he is undoubtedly weak. For he takes the stand that the present political system and labor are essentially antagonistic. Either one must go down. That both must yield something for both to survive he will not admit. But the author's substitute is no remedy, for his industrial democracy would end in an autocracy. The very group-consciousness that he builds so much upon would bring this about as it has in Russia. Not new systems, Mr. Tannenbaum's or other radical systems, are needed as much as new manhood and womanhood. Though that is the renewal most urgent, it is the last advocated by most writers and leaders of social thought.

G. C. T.

San Diego Mission. By FR. ZEPHYRIN ENGELHARDT, O. F. M. San Francisco: The James H. Barry Co. \$3.00.

The tireless Father Engelhardt, the best authority there is on "The Missions and Missionaries of California," has completed in the book under review a volume of his "New Series, Local History," which gives a detailed and admirably documented account of the first Franciscan Mission to be founded within the limits of what is now the State of California. The renowned Father Junipero Serra, assisted by Father Parron, started the Mission San Diego de Alcalá near what is now Old Town on Sunday, July 16, 1770, and the author closely follows in this interesting volume the varying fortunes of the Mission from that time till 1846 when the Father's property was "alienated" by Governor Pico. It is a very inspiring record of a great Religious Order's missionary activities in one small portion of their extensive field.

We read how Mission San Diego had its martyr in the

Venerable Father Luis Jayme, its conflicts with the civil power, as when Captain Revera was excommunicated for violating the right of sanctuary, and its fruitful and consoling spiritual harvests, for nearly 6,500 Indians were converted, baptized and taught to practise Christianity by the zealous Fathers. Particularly interesting are the pages describing how capably the resources of the Mission were developed. To force the hard earth to yield the poor Indians a livelihood, the Franciscans became skilled engineers and constructed a tile aqueduct three miles long resting on cobblestones in cement and carrying a stream of water a foot deep and two feet wide. "The aqueduct often crossed gulches from fifteen to twenty feet wide and deep, and was so strong that in places it supported itself after the foundations were removed." The daily routine of life at the Mission is detailed, the method followed in instructing the natives described, well-merited tributes are paid to the high character of the missionaries, and their ignorant or malevolent traducers are refuted. The volume ends with short biographical sketches of the chief Fathers who served Mission San Diego.

W. D.

Adventurers of the Night. By G. A. BIRMINGHAM. New York: George H. Doran Co. \$1.90.

Galusha the Magnificent. By JOSEPH C. LINCOLN. New York: D. Appleton & Co. \$2.00.

Here are two very amusing stories for summer reading. The first tells how the Protestant parson of Carrigahooly, a village on the west coast of Ireland, is persuaded by the blandishments of the fair Molly to accompany her father to the neighboring island of Inisheeny to search for "crannogs." But there the Flanagan clan makes moonshine whiskey, and visitors are anything but welcome. Nevertheless the parson, his nephew Tommy, Molly and her father set sail for the island, and all the adventures they have during the ensuing forty-eight hours are most divertingly described by the witty and genial author. He takes many sly shots at the English Misgovernment, and sees the humors of Sinn Fein, too.

"Galusha the Magnificent" is an excellent novel with Cape Cod as its setting. It has plot, atmosphere, real characterization, and its humor is delightful. Mr. Lincoln has written some good books, and for once publishers' notices may be taken literally when they proclaim this novel his best. So much formula-writing has invaded modern fiction that it is a positive relief to pick up Galusha and follow his character through a very eventful year, for he is anything but a formula. The author knows the Cape Cod country thoroughly, and makes it live. There is not a dull moment from the time Galusha enters East Wellmouth until he leaves for his Egyptian expedition.

T. D.

Notes on Life and Letters. By JOSEPH CONRAD. Garden City: Doubleday Page & Co.

In the author's note prefacing his "Notes on Life and Letters," Joseph Conrad tells us that this collection is an "appeal to orderly minds," and also that it is a process of tidying up the work done in this line from the year '98 to the year '20. He tells us that it is "a thin array (for such a stretch of time) of really irrelevant attitudes; Conrad literary, Conrad political, Conrad reminiscent, Conrad controversial." The book taken from any one of these angles,—literary, political, reminiscent, or controversial,—is a charming contribution to English books of essays, coming from the pen of a man who at once convinces his reader of his love for truth and sincerity. The subjects of the collection, some twenty-five in number, cover a vast area. In the letters Mr. Conrad ranges from "Henry James" to "Stephen Crane," from "An Observer in Malaya" to "The Life Beyond." In the part of the volume that the author designates as Life, the sea plays an important part. Here Mr. Conrad

seems to be at his best, and even in that essay in which one would hardly look for a touch of the sea, "Poland Revisited," ships and the sea have a call that is all his own.

The style of the author is charming; he has an ease in English that makes one wonder, and it is hard to convince oneself that the medium of expression used in the book is not native to the writer. There is also present a trick of style, if that expression is not an unworthy one, shown in the use of the parenthetical clause, and this trick wins the reader and makes him feel that Conrad himself, with the twinkle in his eye, is enjoying the sudden turn that the thought has taken. Above all the book radiates kindness and cheerfulness, for the author is the gentlest of critics. He sees good in all things and all men, and this because he is full of faith. What Mr. Conrad says of Daudet may well be said of himself: "A man naively clear, honest, and vibrating as the sunshine of his native land; that regretfully indiscriminating sunshine which matures grapes and pumpkins alike, and cannot of course obtain the commendations of the very select who look at life from under a parasol." J. S. K.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

Napoleon and Shakespeare.—Macmillan has brought out new editions of Sir Walter Raleigh's "Shakespeare" which is one of the "English Men of Letters" series, and of Miss Ida M. Tarbell's "Life of Napoleon" to which is added a sketch of the Empress Josephine's career. The author of the first, after a discerning introduction on the genius of the great poet, gives informing chapters called "Stratford and London. "Books and Poetry," "The Theater," "Story and Character," and "The Last Phase." The other volume is chiefly made up of papers contributed to *McClure's Magazine* some twenty-five years ago and offers a life of Napoleon that is brief and readable, but which does not go much below the surface. The Corsican was a remarkable military genius but his virtues were very few and nearly everything he built up has fallen down, yet he will still be called "the great," no doubt. As biographies of Napoleon's wife are not so common, Miss Tarbell's sketch of Josephine should prove very convenient. The volume is full of interesting pictures.

Essays and Travel.—Irvin S. Cobb's "Plea for Old Cap Collier" (Doran, \$0.75) is an amusing study of the old district-school readers which are unfavorably contrasted with the "Nichol Libraries" that the boys of forty years ago were soundly spanked for reading—if caught. In Mr. Cobb's opinion Nick Carter or Big-Foot Wallace was a far more interesting, sensible and lifelike character than the hero of "Excelsior" or the boy on the burning deck.—The brief contributions to the magazines which Mr. Thomas L. Masson has put into a volume called "Well, Why Not?" (Doubleday, \$1.50), seem, for the most part, hardly deserving of a permanent home in a book. However, the paper "On Skipping," one of the best, can be judiciously practised.—George Borrow, the author of "The Bible in Spain" and a zealous Protestant propagandist, also wrote, besides some novels, a very readable book on "Wild Wales: Its People, Language and Scenery" (Oxford University Press, \$1.00). In the year 1854 he made a walking tour through that country and in this well-packed little book now printed as one of the "World's Classics" series, he tells what he saw and heard there and describes all the adventures he had. On several occasions he was mistaken for a priest by Irish workmen who insisted on securing his blessing. Pitying the benighted Papists' superstition, he gave them all the blessings he had.

Short Stories.—*A Dartmoor Story.*—Thomas Burke's success with "Limehouse Nights" has, no doubt prompted the publication of "More Limehouse Nights" (Doran, \$1.90). The au-

thor has a keen eye for horrors, and while at least two of his stories possess artistic merit, none of them is suitable reading for the family circle.—“The Street of a Thousand Delights” (McBride, \$1.90) by Jay Gelzer, is a series of short stories, all of which seem to draw their inspiration, such as it is, from the “Limehouse Nights.” Burke lays the scene in London, Gelzer in Melbourne, but the theme in each case is the same.—“The Indiscretions of Archie” (Doran, \$1.75) by P. G. Wodehouse, is a modest volume containing a series of stories well described by the book’s title. Clean, amusing, and calling for no intellectual concentration for a full grasp of its content, “The Indiscretions of Archie” is a production which it is a pleasure to praise and to recommend without reserve to the summer traveler.—“The Love of Long Ago” (Doubleday, \$1.75) by Marie Corelli proves how easily a publisher can be deceived and is a tribute to the long-suffering of proof-readers and reviewers.—In “Orphan Dinah” (New York: Macmillan, \$2.50) Mr. Eden Phillpotts has written a characteristic Dartmoor story. It raises the problem not so uncommon in life of a man marrying a wife and then finding to his shame that she has already been false to the highest ideals of maidenhood. Leaving her, after some years he meets one worthier of his love and makes her his bride. In the present story Lawrence Maynard lured into marriage by an adventuress, whom he immediately abandons, subsequently meets the orphan Dinah of the story. Their fates and their love are slowly linked together. To the high-strung passionate Dartmoor maid Maynard frankly confesses the tragedy of his life. In spite of the existence of the former wife, Dinah, to the horror of the countryside, is willing to give him her life and her love. The author maintains that in doing so, she is right, holding that Maynard was in reality never married. For substantial reasons affecting both the individual and society, the Catholic Church holds a different opinion, and condemns such a conclusion.

Chaotic Education.—The reader of “Sociological Determination of Objectives in Education” (Lippincott, \$2.50) will undoubtedly get a strong impression of the chaotic state of American education. The author, David Snedden, is unsparing in his criticism, and most positive too in his suggested improvements. The book is interesting more because of the mode of thought it reveals than for any definite group of statements contained therein. And that mode of thought confuses education with information. Mr. Snedden has many suggestions for the improvement of educational curricula. He is violent in his attacks on the liberal-arts college; he would break with all the traditional methods of the past, and furnish our youth with an equipment that will fit them for a twentieth-century democracy. In his attack upon Latin he fails to distinguish between the study of the Latin language and the cultivation of Latin literature. In fact there is scarcely a page in his book that shows he has any appreciation of literature as an educational medium. The chapter on the formation of moral character is a great disappointment. With no clear ideals either of morality or character the author assures his readers that our schools even now “are reasonably effective agencies of character-formation so far as that character is essential to the social requirements of the school group life itself.” The one conclusion that stands out strongly in these pages is that our so-called American educators are rashly experimenting in their field.

The “Sign.”—And now the Passionist Fathers have started an illustrated monthly magazine. It is called the *Sign*, it is published at West Hoboken, N. J., Father Theodore Noonan, C. P., is the editor, and the subscription price is \$2.00 a year. Computing that less than twenty-five per cent of the Catholics in the United States read any Catholic periodical whatever, the Fathers believe that the *Sign* may appeal to some of the re-

maining seventy-five per cent. In making its bow to the public the new monthly announces that its purpose is “to disseminate truth, to combat the thousand and one errors confronting Catholics at every turn, to interpret from a Catholic viewpoint current events,” and to hold up “the sign of the Son of Man—the norm of Catholic thought and conduct.” The *Sign* will also be the official organ of the Archconfraternity of the Sacred Passion. The August number contains “Some Personal Recollections of Cardinal Gibbons” by Felix Ward, C. P., “The White Rose of Lucca,” being a sketch of Gemma Galgani, by Matthew Kuebel, “Impressions of a Present-Day Calvary,” which is an account of the marvelous Limpas crucifix, by Father Bernardine Dusch, C. P., and “Yourself and the Movies,” by Anselm Secor. AMERICA heartily welcomes the *Sign* to the ranks of Catholic journalism. May its years be long and prosperous.—The *Catholic Mind* for August 8, contains an excellent paper by Father Pollen on “Cardinal Manning and the Jesuits.” The author shows that the strictures passed on the Society of Jesus by the subject of Mr. Leslie’s recent biography were chiefly due to his Eminence’s confusing the “perfection” of bishops with that of religious, and to his unfamiliarity with the history of the Church in England. Then the Holy Father’s Allocution on the Jews in Palestine is given, the reasons “Why the Church Uses Latin” are told, and the number ends with a short article on “The Fate of Unbaptized Infants.”

For Theologians.—Ferdinand Cavallera, “Lector Theologiae Positivae” in the Toulouse faculty, has placed all teachers and students of theology heavily in his debt by preparing an exhaustive and up-to-date “*Thesaurus Doctrinae Catholicae ex Documentis Magisterii Ecclesiastici*” (Gabriel Beauchesne, Paris, 35 fr.), containing a full and orderly arrangement of the Church’s symbols, definitions and decrees. The compiler arranges the wealth of matter contained in the book’s 900 pages under eight sections, beginning with the decisions of Popes and councils “*De Revelatione*,” ending with “*De Novissimis*,” and including between what has been defined regarding the Church, the Roman Pontiff, the nature of God, the Sacraments, etc. Appended there is a thorough chronological index followed by an alphabetical one and last of all a valuable table of cross-references between this book and the well-known Denzinger-Bannwarts’s “*Enchiridion*.”—The fifth edition of Dr. Charles Telch’s excellent “*Epitome Theologiae Moralis Universae*” (Pustet, \$1.50), a handy summary of Father Noldin’s well-known work, has been revised to conform with the New Code of Canon Law.

BOOKS RECEIVED

- D. Appleton & Co., New York:
Your Biggest Job: School or Business? By Henry Louis Smith, Ph.D. \$1.00; Ernest Renan. By Lewis Freeman Mott. \$4.00; The Rifleman of the Ohio. By Joseph A. Altsheler. \$1.75.
- Benziger Brothers, New York:
The Summa Theologica of St. Thomas Aquinas. Part II (Second Part) QQ. CXXI—CLXX. Literally Translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province. \$3.00.
- Blaise Benziger & Co., Inc., New York:
Practical Method of Reading the Breviary. By Rev. John Murphy. Edwin S. Gorham, 11 West 45th St., New York:
The Valiant Heart. By E. M. Tenison.
- The Courier Co., San Francisco:
The Hope of Our Children, a Treatise on Tuberculosis in Juveniles. Translated by Dr. Max Rothschild. \$0.60.
- E. P. Dutton & Co., New York:
Shelley and Calderon, and Other Essays on English and Spanish Poetry. By Salvador de Madariaga. \$6.00; Thus to Revisit. Some Reminiscences. By Ford Madox Hueffer. \$6.50; Torchlight. By Leonie Aminoff. \$2.00.
- George H. Doran Co., New York:
Rosaleen Among the Artists. By Elizabeth Sanxay Holding. \$1.90; Sight Unseen and Confession. By Mary Roberts Rinehart. \$1.75.
- Examiner Press, Bombay:
About the Bible. By the Most Rev. Alban Goodier, S.J.
- The Four Seas Co., Boston:
Strindberg the Man. By Gustaf Uddgren. Translated from the Swedish by Axel John Uppvall, Ph.D. \$2.00; Originality and Other Essays. By William H. McMaster. \$2.00; The Masque of Morning and Other Poems. By Edward Viets. \$1.50.
- Harcourt, Brace & Co., New York:
Queen Victoria. By Lytton Strachey. \$5.00; Poems, New and Old. By John Freeman.

- B. Herder Co., St. Louis:
A Commentary on the New Canon Law. By the Rev. P. Charles Augustine, O.S.B., D.D. Vol. VII. Ecclesiastical Procedure (Book IV) (Can. 1552-1194) \$2.50; Treasury of Indulgences. By M. P. Donelan. \$0.50.
- Houghton, Mifflin Co., Boston:
Vanessa and Her Correspondence with Jonathan Swift. The Letters Edited for the First Time from the Originals. With an Introduction by A. Martin Freeman. \$2.50; The Basque Country. Painted by Romilly Fedden. Described by Katherine Fedden. Illustrated. \$6.00.
- Mitchell Kennerley, New York:
Second April. By Edna St. Vincent Millay. \$2.00.
- Henry H. Klein, New York:
Dynastic America and Those Who Own It. By Henry H. Klein. \$2.00.
- Alfred A. Knopf, New York:
The Borough Treasurer. By J. S. Fletcher. \$2.00; Pan. Translated from the Norwegian of Knut Hamsun. By W. W. Worster. \$2.00.
- Ann Stuart Logan, Chicago:
Citizens' Almanac. Issued by Americanization Department Woman's Committee Council of National Defense, Illinois Division.
- Longmans, Green & Co., New York:
The Pilgrim, a Review of Christian Politics and Religion. July, 1921. \$0.85; An Enthusiast. By E. C. Somerville. \$2.00.
- The Macmillan Co., New York:
The Labor Problem and the Social Catholic Movement in France. A Study in the History of Social Politics. By Parker Thomas Moon; The Hound of Heaven, an Interpretation. By Rev. Francis P. LeBuffe, S.J. \$1.25; The Heel of Achilles. By E. M. Delafield. \$2.50; The Parish School, Its Aims, Procedure and Problems. By Rev. Joseph A. Dunne; Sex for Parents and Teachers. By William Leland Slowell, M.D. Illustrated. \$3.00; Selected Poems. By William Butler Yeats.
- Manhattan and Bronx Advocate, New York:
Freedom, Truth and Beauty. Sonnets by Edward Doyle.
- Oxford University Press, New York:
Courage in Politics and Other Essays, 1885-1896. By Coventry Patmore; The Story of My Life. By Colonel Philip Meadows Taylor. New Edition with Introduction and Notes by Henry Bruce.
- G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York:
Book of Birds for Young People. By F. Schuyler Mathews. Illustrated in Color and in Black and White. \$3.00. The Mirrors of Washington. With Fourteen Cartoons by Cesare and Fourteen Portraits. \$2.50.
- The Talbot Press, Dublin:
Excursions in Thought. By "Imaal." 6s.
- Funk & Wagnalls Co., New York:
Historic English. By James C. Fernald, L.H.D. \$1.90; Will Power and Work. By Jules Payot, Litt.D., Ph.D. Authorized Translation by Richard Duffey. \$1.75.
- Joseph F. Wagner, Inc., New York:
A Parochial Course of Doctrinal Instructions for All Sundays and Holydays of the Year. Based on the Teachings of the Catechism of the Council of Trent and Harmonized with the Gospels and Epistles of the Sundays and Feasts. Prepared and Arranged by the Rev. Charles J. Callan, O.P. and the Rev. John A. McHugh, O.P. With an Introduction by the Most Rev. Patrick J. Hayes, D.D. Dogmatic Series. Vol. II. \$3.50.

EDUCATION

The Poor Schoolteacher

"OF course," said the truculent, swelling dame, "of course, you are only a poor schoolteacher." Isn't that "of course" delicious? But so, too, is the rest of the sentence, and the sentiment. "Only" and "poor" and "schoolteacher" are as combs of honey dished on a silver platter; linked phrases like "perfidious" and "Albion" during the Napoleonic wars, or "dull" and "thud" in our own day. In one of his delightful little books, "The Prig" shows by conclusive evidence (another linked phrase!) that in England "poor" when applied to the dead, is equivalent to "Saint," and may be ranked with equipollent canonization. And Canon Sheehan, I believe, agrees with "The Prig." The Irish call St. Joseph "poor St. Joseph" because they love him. But they would never call Mr. Lloyd George, for instance, "poor," even did he end his days as destitute as Lazarus at the gate of Dives. Not that the Prime Minister will ever sit so near beatitude. The inhabitants South of Ulster, if I do not misinterpret them, incline to hold that unless he speedily mends his ways, the Premier is more likely to read his future in the fate of Dives. But I intend no discursion upon politics; I merely meant to say that this truculent lady, in view of the teacher's "poorness," graciously agreed not to report her to the Board. For her husband, being a rich man and a man of political weight, would surely prevail upon the Board to dismiss the "poor" teacher, innocent as she was.

CONTENT WITH CRUMBS

NOW we Americans do not speak of the "poor" teacher in the sense of equipollent canonization. We call her poor because most of us think of her as shabby and anxious and petty and narrow and cringing and stupid and a bit sordid; and to

this creature we entrust the training of our children. I too have been a teacher and have lived under the shadow of all these adjectives. We are a curious lot, we Americans; and our English cousins, or whatever the relationship may be, are not much better. Thackeray gives us the Misses Pinkerton, and the Reverend Lawrence Veal, at whose pinchbeck establishment "everybody had prizes for everything at the end of the year." Dickens is better known for Squeers and Mr. Mell than for Dr. Strong, although Dickens evidently considered this milk-and-water old gentleman a very type of all that a schoolmaster should be. No, in English and American tradition, the schoolmaster does not cut a pretty figure. "A foremost place," translates Sir Thomas Chaloner, Knt., from Erasmus in 1559, "is occupied by the schoolmasters. . . . Verily, their lot is a woeful one indeed, cursed—not as the Greek epigram has it, with five—but with five hundred drawbacks. It is a lot of semi-starvation and of debasing slavery. . . . Yet notwithstanding this, they are by no means such miserable creatures as you might at first sight be inclined to imagine. In their own estimation they are important personages enough, and think themselves mightily fine fellows; but whilst they strut about with stern looks and scolding voices, striking terror and alarm into the breasts of a set of trembling urchins, half-scarifying the little wretches occasionally with canes and birches and straps, and exercising their arbitrary tyranny over them in all sorts of ways, they, after all, do but ludicrously perform the part of the ass in the well-known fable. They have a wonderfully good opinion of themselves," and so on. Plainly, Erasmus was in a customary spleenful mood when he drew that picture, and the mood has been retained through the centuries. In some degree, the teacher himself is in fault. He has been too content to sit at the feet of his inferiors, nourishing his emaciated frame as best he might with the crumbs that fell from the tables.

THE RICH MAN'S TABLE

TAKE, for instance, Ascham's "Preface" to "The Schoolmaster," and see how dearly that good man loved a Lord. "When the great Plague was at London," I transcribe from my edition of 1711, "the Year 1563, the Queen's Majesty, Queen Elizabeth, lay at her Castle of Windsor: Where upon the tenth day of December, it fortuned that in Sir William Cecil's chamber, her Highness's principal Secretary, there dined together these Personages, M. Secretary himself, Sir William Peter, Sir J. Mason, D. Wotton, Sir Richard Sackville, Treasurer of the Exchequer, Sir Walter Mildmay, Chancellor of the Exchequer, M. Haddon, Master of Requests, M. John Astely, Master of the Jewel-House, M. Bernard Hampton, M. Nicasius, and I. Of which number, the most part were of her Majesty's most honorable Privy Council, and the rest serving her in very good place. I was glad then, and do rejoyce yet to remember, that my chance was so happy to be there that day, in the company of so many wise and good Men together as hardly then could have been picked out again out of all England besides." But, alas, poor Master Ascham, though he might now and then sit at the table of the great, must confess in that same Preface: "For, seeing at my death, I am not like to leave them ['my poor Children'] any great Store of living, therefore in my life time, I thought good to bequeath unto them, in this little Book, as in my Will and Testament, the right way to good Learning: which if they follow, with the fear of God, they shall very well come to Sufficiency of living." But this pious aspiration was not wholly fulfilled, for Margaret Ascham was soon forced to address the same Sir William Cecil, Knt., recalling "how much my said Husband was many ways bound to you, and how gladly and comfortably he used in his life to recognize, and report your Goodness toward him, leaving with me, then, his poor Widow, and a great sort of Orphans, a good Comfort in the hope of your good continuance."

THE PERENNIAL PROBLEM

"SUFFICIENCY of living" was then as now the problem of many a teacher. It might be very well if today, as Professor Leacock observes, the teacher were allowed to wear a long brown gown, with sandals and bare feet, and if instead of feeding at a three-dollar boarding-house, "he carried a bowl at his girdle into which people of their own free will put lentils and peas and sweet herbs." Then his sufficiency would be insured. But being no longer a mendicant friar, he cannot claim the privilege of that Order. At least, not with the same immediately observable results. He, or she, for the teacher of whom we prose is generally a lady, must act the mendicant to Boards, and flatter prejudices and play politics, and alas! swallow insults. "She was glad enough to come for that salary," said a chairman to the Board, when a teacher's petition for a living-wage was under scant consideration. "If she can't stay on, as she says she can't, let her go. We can get another. Teachers are cheap." Bumble's Board for Paupers could have done no better; or worse. "When Aristippus, the disciple of Socrates," runs a familiar passage in Udall's Erasmus, "had of his gaires, of setting up the teaching of Philosophie for money (which thing he first of all the scholars of Socrates, did set up and begin to doe) had sent 20 poundes unto his maister: Socrates sent the money back again unto hym forthwith, alleging that his familiar good Aungil would in no wise suffer him to take it. For Socrates saied, that he had a familiar ghost or Aungil peculiar and proper to himself, of whom he was by a privie token forbidden, if he attempted, or went about to dooe any unhonest thyng. Verely, that familiar good Aungil, I suppose, was reason. And in the Meanetye, unto Aristippus, he did after a gentle sort, signifie hymself not to alowe, ne to thinke well doen, that he kept a schoole of morall Philosophie for money, and therefore the same gifte of his as a thyng gotten by plaine sacrilege, he utterly refused, and would have none of it."

Noble indeed, but Socrates knew what good living was. His daily drink was not hemlock. Plain living and high thinking are an excellent régime, but a man cannot subsist upon thought alone. He needs his carbohydrates, his fats, his roughage and his vitamins, all of which are bought for a price in the open market. Even from the teacher is the price required. I don't know where she is to get it, no more than she does. But I do know that the "Aungil" aforesaid is not proper and peculiar to Socrates. He hovers above all finance committees, forbidding them to commit "plain sacrilege."

JOHN WILTBYE.

SOCIOLOGY

Mint, Anise and Cummin

THE Reverend Doctor Howler of New York had a ring-side seat at the Jersey prize-fight. If he extracted as much enjoyment from the spectacle as his congregation took from hearing him describe it, Messrs. Carpentier and Dempsey have not lived in vain. I need hardly say that his name is not Howler, although he is just as loud under another name. He is a sleuth-like shepherd. He puts on a false beard when he slinks into a dance-hall; he arrays himself in a check-suit such as stage villains wear, and pounds loudly on a cabaret table for a cocktail. I have no criticism of his good intentions, but his technique is dreadful. He might as well carry a trumpet. To the newspapers in search of Monday-morning headlines he is as manna in the wilderness, but to balance his deserts, he is something of a nuisance and a pernicious nuisance at that.

He is sound and fury. He is the whirlwind from which the Lord does not speak. His focus is all wrong, his accent is misplaced and his religion as negative as the minus sign in algebra. He is the modern edition of the old-fashioned preacher who made the avoidance of chewing-tobacco, hard cider, the barn-

dance and poker, the outward signs of inward regeneration. He thinks a man is saved by the rejection of these things together with prize-fights and Sunday baseball, although Sunday golf and the automobile are consistent with godliness in the devotee who has a bank-account. His influence is pernicious because it leads men to believe that religion is something petty and unmanly, and to identify it with puritanism. But puritanism is not religion. Today it is often the same thing as pharisaism. I think we may suspect the judgment of the clerical brother who regards betting on a prize-fight as "the most insidious and debasing of vices" and considers the Jersey City mill the final proof that the country "has gone back to paganism."

GNATS AND CAMELS.

BY contrast, Doctor Howler reminds me of a public prosecutor I once knew, a coarse fellow who occasionally drank a glass of brutalizing beer but raised his average by entertaining an aversion to prize-fights. This, of course, was in the dark age when the demon rum habitually wore the ermine and dictated our laws. The community in which this prosecutor worked had a law obliging the saloons to close on Sunday. The first violation of this law meant a fine and a warning; the second, revocation of the license. This custom did not please the local ministerial association, and they manifested their displeasure by denouncing the prosecutor, who was a home-man with a large family, as the encourager of all that was evil in the county. Then they sent a committee to ask him why he was protecting a business that was destroying the community's morality.

But the prosecutor was equal to the occasion. Ignoring the insulting attitude of the committee on mint, anise and cummin, he informed them that the custom of the office would be maintained. But he denied that an occasional violation of the excise law was "sapping" the morality of the community. He knew three sappers that were doing infinitely more harm, and he offered to donate to any charity named by the association what was in those days a fairly large sum of money, if the association would order a drive against them. Probably he was aware that his money was safe, for he then asked the ministers to raise the moral tone of the community by a series of sermons against birth-control, divorce, and the custom of marrying runaway couples. He had nothing against the dominies, he told me, but he knew their congregations.

THE DOMINANT CONSTRUCTIVE

ON the man who imitates the worm by chewing tobacco or on prize-fighters in general I pass no moral censure. But I must decline to consider either class a serious menace to the social order. And I cannot help thinking that the non-Catholic clergy and very many non-Catholic social workers dissipate too much energy in these days in the discussion of mint, anise and cummin, with less insistence, perhaps, on mint than in the days before the Eighteenth Amendment. The Saviour of the world indicated the fundamental principle of social regeneration when He told the legalists to fight for the soul rather than against what went into the stomach. A foreign review (I cannot quote chapter and verse) recently asked if the splendid energies devoted by American societies against the saloon and the restricted district, had not simply cleansed the outside of the cup, leaving the interior, man's heart, pretty much what it was before. Would not these societies achieve their purpose more effectively, albeit more slowly, if the positive element, the constructive and instructive element, dominated?

It is difficult to understand how we can get very far along the line of social reform unless we can hit upon some plan of bringing religion into the lives of the rising generation. Law alone is insufficient. It can and ought to check as far as possible external manifestations of evil. It can be used to remove external incitements to immorality and public disorder, such as the in-

decent stage and film, and the commercializing of the social evil. It can encourage the good and penalize the bad. All this it should do. But it is one thing to enact a law, quite another to enforce it. The penal code of New York with regard to the stage, for instance, is satisfactory. If enforced, it would place half a dozen Orientals and twice that number of newspaper proprietors and editors who advertise these immoral productions, behind the bars. But it is not enforced, probably cannot be enforced, because juries will not convict, and the chief result of an indictment would be an amount of valuable free advertising. The law demands a higher degree of morality than the public is willing to sanction. A sixty-per-cent public morality may enforce a forty-per-cent law. But a forty-per-cent public morality can never enforce a sixty-per-cent law. That is almost a mathematical verity.

LAWS AND MORALITY.

HENCE the futility of thinking that public morality can be sufficiently guaranteed by law. If a majority of the community is self-determined to avoid what is evil and practise what is right, very little legislation will be needed. When that self-determination breaks down, or when it has never been well developed, laws are multiplied. A private society continually forced to legislate had better dissolve. The interior spirit which prompted and justified its founding is dead. So with the community which hopes to secure order by a liberal use of the policeman's club. Society then degenerates into something like a troupe of trained lions, trained to obey at the crack of the State whip.

Never, as Lilly the English philosopher once remarked, had we so many laws and so little law. Federal "law" tells us what we may not drink. Some State laws forbid us to smoke in public. Yet, as Fosdick does not hesitate to say, we are a criminal people. We rank high in arson, in murder, in riot; we have very little respect for marriage, none at all for religion in the school, and it is to be feared that, with France, we are becoming a nation of empty cradles. I read today that in the first six months of 1921, not counting the murders committed by the Tulsa mob, in six Southern States thirty-six men and women were lynched. We have juvenile courts all over the country, vocational schools, probation systems, tooth-brush drills, public playgrounds and summer camps. But the race of baby bandits and youthful murderers increases daily. We seem willing to do everything for the next generation except teach it religion. And in our religion for adults we carefully avoid the delicate subjects of education, race-suicide, and divorce, to preach against beer, cigarettes and prize-fights.

BACK TO REAL RELIGION.

THE social factor of highest importance next to religion is the school founded on the principle that morality is at least as necessary to civil society as reading, writing and arithmetic. Periodically, men like Judges Talley, Crain and McMahon, and Chief Magistrate McAdoo of New York state that "something must be done" to teach the child his duties to God, his country, his neighbor and himself. Annually many non-Catholic religious associations memorialize the need of religious training, but I regret that for the most part these noble resolutions never get beyond the printed report. Non-Catholic individuals and societies appear to be paralyzed by fear of offending the public school, and the most they hope for is "Bible-reading without note or comment," or that chimera "non-sectarian morality." Yet the mere reading of an ancient code of law and morality, "without note or comment" does not build moral fiber. "Non-sectarian" usually means "non-religious," and morality without religion, is a delusion or a fraud. Most of us fall not because we do not know the difference between right and wrong, but because we have not given the will a motive sufficiently strong to keep it on the

path of duty. Definite religious training can alone supply that motive.

In denouncing Messrs. Carpentier, Dempsey, Rickard and the Governor of New Jersey, the Reverend Doctor Howler is wasting perfectly good breath. If the public prints are to be credited, he surely expended a vast deal of time and physical energy in attending the fight, writing his most imaginative description, and reading it *cum gestibus* to his congregation. Dr. Howler is a symptom of the present-day surface-morality, a type of the modern association which insists upon the mint and anise and cummin to the neglect of the weightier things of the law. Why not forget for a time the saloon and the boxer, and shift the denunciation to those clergymen who encourage polygamy by blessing "marriage" after divorce, or who, however valorous against the iniquities of Rome, never dare a word against the iniquities of birth-control? Better still, why not try to bring religion back to the home and to the school? P. L. B.

NOTE AND COMMENT

The "Caritas Socialis" of Vienna.

A NEW association has been formed in Vienna, whose community members are known as Caritas Sisters. They take no vows but pledge themselves to social work. Associated with them are independent members, women and girls who freely devote themselves to the same work. In the home for working women of the *Caritas Socialis* there are 180 girls. A school of domestic science is attached to this home. The *Caritas Socialis* trains young girls in different practical branches and so equips them to earn a livelihood. Those who join the *Caritas Socialis* spend a year in spiritual training and in domestic science. Another year is spent in following courses in social service, and active social work in institutions. The Cardinal Archbishop of Vienna has given his hearty approval to this new association. In Innsbruck the Women's League at St. Ursula's in the Tyrol is striving to put up a home for children that they may be "saved from the dangers of the streets." Both in their work in Vienna and in the Austrian Tyrol womanhood is hoping for the help of the Catholic women of America.

Mission Losses and Gains

IN a recent number of the *Far East*, the official organ of the Irish Mission to China, the 1920 death list of missionaries is announced. Six Bishops and 153 priests died on the missions during the year. The figures covering the entire pagan world are as follows:

Paris Foreign Missions, 40; Congregation of the Holy Ghost, 20; White Fathers, 9; Vincentians, 8; Assumptionists, 4; Marists, 4; Oblates of Mary, 2; Missionaries of the Sacred Heart, 1; South African Missions of Lyons, 1. Among the Bishops 4 were French, one Assyrian and one a Dutchman. Of the priests 89 were French, 19 Belgian, 12 Italian, 7 Irish, 7 Spanish, 5 Dutch, 4 German, 3 American, 2 Canadian, 2 Austrian, 1 Ceylonese, 1 Syrian and 1 Turkish.

There has been an increase of American missionaries in the pagan world according to *Die Katholischen Missionen*. They number 150 priests and Brothers belonging to different Orders and Congregations.

The Gild of the Sacred Heart

IN Adelaide, South Australia, the Gild of the Sacred Heart was established last year with the approval of the Apostolic Delegate and the different Archbishops and Bishops. The purpose of the Gild is to reach boys and girls who have just finished school and give them an opportunity to keep up the practise of going to Holy Communion once a month in a body. Rev. J. C. Hartwell, S. J., the promoter of the Gild in South

Australia in the pamphlet that explains the working of the Gild, very aptly remarks:

These young people leave school with the idea of being always good. But their goodness and piety are laughed at by many, and their religion is ridiculed. They groan in secret; but soon begin to smile at what is in itself bad. They get discouraged, and grow weary, and then allow themselves to be dragged down the precipice and fall. The moment they begin to lead a life that is not good, their faith gets weaker. How many of these young people drop the practise of going to Holy Communion every month? How many go once a year or not at all? Why is it that so many drift and fall away? The reason is because they have lost the *two big helps* they had at school—(1) monthly Communion in a body; (2) the powerful example of a large number of good lads around them. The atmosphere is changed now. They are *isolated*, left to themselves. They require friends to aid them in the struggle against evil, and against human respect. This help will be found in the *result of Holy Communion in a body*.

The organization of the Gild is simplicity itself. A half-dozen boys in a parish are enough for a nucleus. They meet and make out a list of all the boys they know who have left school, and then each one makes himself responsible for six or seven others attending the monthly Communion on a fixed day. There are no expenses or dues and no meetings but the all-important meeting at the Holy Table.

Educational Lunch Counters

IN a recent interview given to the New York Herald, Dean Andrew Fleming West of the Princeton Graduate School remarked that too many American schools furnish educational lunch counters to their pupils. In explaining his statement he continued:

I referred to the elective system of study, which, having elements of good in it, has grown out of all sensible proportion in schools and colleges until too many of our young people are getting education by dabs.

Rigorously to simplify a course of study instead of widening it by permitting a loose choice, to select the proper fundamental studies suitable to the individual, use these as a basis, and then build on that base, is, it appears to me, the way to produce a liberally educated generation. This does not mean more studies but more study.

The importance of extended training in the fundamental studies is what is required. Our present system of education neglects this and there is the root of the difficulty.

I do not believe the people know fully how bad a product our schools are producing. They know something of it; complaints of the product are too frequent to permit of total ignorance, but if the facts were known a change in system would be demanded.

The nineteenth century was the boastful century. We were perfect; our schools were perfect. No other country could compare with ours in what was done here for education. Schoolhouses everywhere, with every modern improvement. Yes, on the outside. It was the age when we were counseled not to knock if we couldn't praise.

The distinguished educator outlined three typical programs of study to remedy the intellectual neurosis in the college world: a modern humanistic course, a modern scientific course, and a course based on mathematics, science, Latin, Greek, English, history, philosophy, economics and a modern language. The best educational work in America has been done on the basis of a large general education. This is the verdict of Dean West, which he declares is backed by the testimony of experience.

Catholics and the Silent Pulpit

A VERY good plea for the proper use of the movies as educational forces recently appeared in the Liverpool Catholic Times. The writer claims that the "cinema is not the rival but the complement of the other arts. As well com-

plain that sculpture, music and painting push aside words. It is confusing two distinct modes of expression, one utilizing words and the other the golden medium of silence." "The writer then declares that the Catholic body in Great Britain has not yet grasped the importance of the cinema for propagating Catholic doctrine:

If we had neglected the art of printing and confined ourselves to the written and spoken word we could not be guilty of greater negligence. The cinema is destined to equal, if not actually outrival, all other methods of expression. I do not agree with a writer in a recent issue of this journal who declared that the cinema is the enemy of mental cultivation. Let it be admitted for the sake of argument that many of the films exhibited are worthless from an educational point of view. The same charge can be brought against the majority of published books and newspapers. The so-called popular press is a menace to education and morality and it is seconded by the salacious novel, but nobody condemns the art of printing on that account. The remedy lies in the direction of utilizing the cinema for a worthier purpose and making it the handmaiden of truth. Education is not merely the ability to absorb words and swallow second-hand opinions.

The task of converting England is admittedly difficult for "in none of the great countries of the world is the educational standard so low. To babble about literature, poetry, daffodils and flowers to a people plunged in pagan darkness, in a country where poets starve and politicians and penny-a-liners are deified, shows an absence of reality." One good film would do more than "a library of controversial literature." What is true of England is true relatively of every nation. The rank and file are marching not to church or library but to the movies.

A Catholic Answer to Bigotry

THE recent report of the forty-eighth annual convention of the International Association of Fire Engineers contains an indictment of bigotry by Fire Chief John Kenlon of New York. At the last meeting of the association, in Toronto, Canada, Chief Kenlon as president of the Fire Chiefs' Association appointed Archbishop Neil McNeill to open the session with prayer. The bigoted press of Toronto objected and Chief Kenlon replied:

The Orange press of Toronto accuses me of being a Catholic. Yes, I am a Catholic and I am proud of it, proud of being a member of that grand old Church that spread the light of Christian Faith throughout the world, whose missionaries and martyrs covered four continents, including the continent we inhabit, before William of Orange, the Dutch king of England, was born.

What is this Orange Society that hangs like the threatening sword of Damocles over our heads? It is a society that proclaims monarchy and practises proscription. It is un-American in every possible sense. I am told that there are high-sounding phrases in its ritual about equal rights and the right of every man to worship God according to his conscience. Those high-sounding phrases, if they do exist, are a dead letter in the practise of Orangeism. They proscribe their Catholic fellow-countrymen, they oppose republicanism. This Orange business sounds strange to many of the Chiefs from the United States. They wonder what it is all about. I happen to know something of the genus Orange in its native habitat. I know it opposes freedom and political advancement. I know that it is the very antithesis of Americanism. Americans wish to see the blessings of liberty enjoyed by all peoples, but the Orangeman denies liberty to every man but himself.

Chief Kenlon closed his address by tendering his resignation. "I submit it with positive reluctance," he said, "but there is nothing less I can do and save my honor as a man. I may lose the presidency, I may lose many things but there is one thing I shall never lose—I shall never compromise my honor for any man or set of men." Chief Kenlon has set a worthy example to Catholics in public life. Toronto will long remember him.